

Weekly Compilation of
**Presidential
Documents**



Monday, March 20, 1995
Volume 31—Number 11
Pages 395–441

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

- Morocco, King Hassan II
 - Arrival—420
 - State dinner—426
- National Conference of State Legislators—431
- National Hockey League champion New York Rangers—438
- National League of Cities—398
- National PTA Legislative Conference—410
- NCAA football champion Nebraska Cornhuskers—398
- Radio address—395
- Radio and TV Correspondents Association dinner—418
- Saint Patrick's Day ceremony—436
- Virginia, regulatory reform in Arlington—426

Appointments and Nominations

- Central Intelligence Agency, Director, statement—396
- U.S. Marine Corps, Commandant, statement—417

Communications to Congress

- Iranian petroleum resources, message—425

Communications to Federal Agencies

- California floods, memorandum on Federal employees affected—438
- Chechnya, memorandum on assistance to victims—409
- Palestinian police force, memorandum on assistance—435

Executive Orders

- Israel-United States Binational Industrial Research and Development Foundation—408
- Prohibiting Certain Transactions With Respect to the Development of Iranian Petroleum Resources—424

Interviews With the News Media

- Exchange with reporters in the Roosevelt Room—436
- News conference with King Hassan II of Morocco, March 15 (No. 89)—421

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

- Ireland, Prime Minister Bruton—436
- Morocco, King Hassan II—420, 421, 426

Proclamations

- National Day of Prayer—417
- National Public Health Week—409

Statements by the President

- See also* Appointments and Nominations
- California, disaster assistance—397
- Housing and Urban Development Secretary Henry Cisneros—417
- Transportation Secretary Federico Peña—435

Supplementary Materials

- Acts approved by the President—441
- Checklist of White House press releases—440
- Digest of other White House announcements—439
- Nominations submitted to the Senate—440

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

Published every Monday by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC 20408, the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* contains statements, messages, and other Presidential materials released by the White House during the preceding week.

The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* is published pursuant to the authority contained in the Federal Register Act (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U.S.C. Ch. 15), under

regulations prescribed by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, approved by the President (37 FR 23607; 1 CFR Part 10).

Distribution is made only by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* will be furnished by mail to domestic subscribers for \$80.00 per year (\$137.00 for mailing first class) and to foreign subscribers for \$93.75 per year, payable to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The charge for a single copy is \$3.00 (\$3.75 for foreign mailing).

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents*.

Week Ending Friday, March 17, 1995

The President's Radio Address

March 11, 1995

Good morning. I ran for President to keep the American dream alive for the forgotten middle class and for all of those struggling to make it in our country, to make sure all Americans have the chance to live up to their God-given potential. Today in Washington, there's a great debate about how best to do that, and the choices we make will say a lot about who we are as a nation as we enter the new century.

On one side, there's the old one-size-fits-all Washington view that big Government can fix every problem. On the other, there's the Republican contract view that the Federal Government is the cause of every problem. Well, I have a different view. I believe the purpose of Government is to expand opportunity, not bureaucracy, to empower people through education to make the most of their own lives, and to enhance our security on our streets and around the world. I believe in a Government that is limited but effective, lean but not mean, not a savior but not on the sidelines, a partner in the fight for the future. I believe in a Government that promotes opportunity but demands responsibility and that understands that we need all Americans in strong grassroots communities. That's what the New Covenant is all about, opportunity and responsibility.

Let me give you two examples. First, with regard to welfare reform, I believe we should offer more opportunity in terms of education and work to people on welfare, but we must demand more responsibility, tougher child support enforcement, responsible parenting, and the requirement that to receive benefits, young people should be in school or working toward going to work.

Or take the college loan program. Our administration believes more people should go to college, so we've offered more opportunity to millions of young people, more affordable

college loans with much better repayment terms. But we've insisted on more responsibility. The cost to you, the taxpayers, of delinquent college loans has gone down from \$2.8 billion a year to \$1 billion a year since I took office, opportunity and responsibility.

Look at the economy. When I took office, we had no economic strategy for putting people first. Instead, we'd had 12 years in which trickle-down economics had quadrupled the deficit and investments in our people had been ignored. There was less opportunity and less responsibility. Today, we're reducing the deficit by over \$600 billion. The Federal work force is down by over 150,000 and will soon be the smallest since John Kennedy was President. We cut 300 programs in our first two budgets, and this year, we want to eliminate or combine 400 more. But while we've cut, we're also helping people to invest in their future, more for Head Start to apprenticeships, to college loans, to training for adults. The results are clear: This strategy is working.

We have the lowest combined rate of unemployment and inflation in 25 years. Since I became President, we have 6.1 million more jobs. Now, there's more to do. More people want work, and too many people haven't gotten a raise and are living with economic uncertainty. We've got to keep cutting unnecessary spending and investing in growing our economy.

The old view resisted change, but the Republican contract view often goes too far. Let me give you another example. We want to save money and to change the Agriculture Department, and so do the Republicans. The old view just left the Agriculture Department alone, though agriculture has changed greatly. My approach was to close 1,200 offices and to shrink the bureaucracy. But the Republicans want to cut the school lunch program that's helped our children thrive for 50 years.

You'll see this debate played out in many areas. One involves AmeriCorps, our national service program. AmeriCorps is about opportunity and responsibility. You get a helping hand for your own education if you give one to your country. Our young AmeriCorps volunteers are partners with our communities, with nurses, pastors, police officers, doing work that won't get done any other way. They're walking police beats in Brooklyn, building homes in Georgia, fighting fires in Idaho.

Jamie Kendrick is one of these young people. He's here with me, along with some other AmeriCorps volunteers today. He works with disadvantaged children in Baltimore. And as he does, he's helping them to help others. Every week, he leads more than 90 troubled kids into a nursing home to visit older people. The seniors get companionship and a chance to share their wisdom. The children, many of whom come from broken homes, now know older people who care about them. And Jamie knows he's serving others as he earns tuition for college. This is a good deal for Jamie, for the seniors, for the young people, and for us, too. We get better citizens, stronger communities, and more education.

I want to keep AmeriCorps growing. Right now, Republicans in the House of Representatives are proposing to cut off opportunities in AmeriCorps for 15,000 people like Jamie. Then they want to end AmeriCorps altogether. But AmeriCorps isn't a bureaucracy, it's a grassroots partnership to build strong communities through opportunity and responsibility.

The House Republicans want to cut all this and more, including the Safe and Drug-Free Schools program, the summer jobs program to pay for huge tax cuts costing \$700 billion over 10 years and benefiting mostly upper income Americans. AmeriCorps, the school lunch program, the Safe and Drug-Free Schools programs, all together, they cost a tiny fraction of that.

Now, I believe we must keep cutting spending, and we should give middle-class Americans tax relief to help pay for their education, their child rearing, their health care costs. But this proposal goes too far. The path

to the future is through opportunity and responsibility.

Before I close, I want to emphasize that in spite of these differences, I think we can make real progress now. We don't have to give in to gridlock. I've already signed a bill to apply to Congress the laws it applies to private business, and we're about to complete a bill to limit the ability of Congress to pass mandates on the State and local government without paying for them.

There's more we can do to cut pork, not people, in the Federal budget. We're about to begin debate in the Senate on the line-item veto, an issue on which the Republican leaders and I strongly agree. We need to pass it and keep cutting unnecessary spending.

This can be a very good time for our country if we all remember our mission: to make life easier, not harder for middle income families, to grow the middle class and shrink the underclass, to make the future brighter, not darker, for our young people, to promote opportunity and responsibility.

We must keep faith with the American dream. The Jamie Kendricks of our country will do right by all of us if we will do right by them.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:06 a.m. from the Oval Office at the White House.

Statement on the Withdrawal of Michael Carns and the Nomination of John Deutch as Director of Central Intelligence *March 11, 1995*

It is with profound regret that I accept General Michael Carns' decision to withdraw his name from consideration for the position of Director of Central Intelligence.

I understand General Carns' concern that allegations made against him in the course of his background investigation could be misconstrued and complicate his confirmation. The sad truth is that we live in a time when even the most exemplary individuals like General Carns, who already has given so much to his country, are deterred from serving by the fear that their records will be distorted, their achievements ignored, and their

families maligned during the confirmation process.

General Carns' decision to withdraw is our country's loss. This man, who flew more than 200 combat missions over Southeast Asia and distinguished himself as a military commander and an innovative manager, was prepared to come out of retirement to serve America one more time in a vital mission. I deeply regret that he will not have that opportunity, and that our intelligence community and the American people will not have the benefit of his broad experience, his intelligence, and his dedication.

Finding another individual with the exceptional skills and qualities needed to lead the intelligence community was no easy task. But in Deputy Secretary of Defense John Deutch, who I am pleased to announce my intent to nominate as the next Director of Central Intelligence, we have found such a man.

Deputy Secretary Deutch has served at the highest levels of academia and Government in a wide variety of positions, from assistance professor of chemistry at Princeton to provost at MIT, from Under Secretary of Energy under President Carter to member of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board under President Bush, from Under Secretary of Defense to Deputy Secretary of Defense in my administration.

Over the past 2 years, I've enjoyed an increasingly close personal and professional relationship with Deputy Secretary Deutch. Together with former Defense Secretary Aspin and Secretary Perry, I have asked Deputy Secretary Deutch to take on some of the toughest, most important assignments at the Pentagon.

Deputy Secretary Deutch has played a lead role in reviewing our nuclear force posture. He's overseen the modernizing of our weapons systems. And he has become intimately familiar with the workings of the intelligence community, especially its support for the military. The blueprint Deputy Secretary Deutch worked out to eliminate redundancies and duplication between our civilian and military intelligence demonstrates the kind of innovative thinking we need to meet the new challenges of the post-cold-war world.

Strengthening U.S. intelligence is an effort to which I attach the highest personal priority. To make that commitment absolutely clear, and to underscore that he will be a full member of my national security team, I have decided to appoint Deputy Secretary Deutch to my cabinet if he is confirmed as Director of Central Intelligence.

In John Deutch, we have a dynamic, brilliant leader with all the necessary skills for this critical assignment and my highest trust and confidence. I look forward to working with him, the Aspin commission, and Congress in building an intelligence community that will meet our national security challenges well into the next century.

NOTE: A statement by Michael Carns was also made available by the Office of the Press Secretary.

Statement on Disaster Assistance for California

March 12, 1995

Today, I am declaring that a major disaster exists in California. Federal funds will begin to flow to the individuals and communities affected by this latest terrible act of nature. California has been badly hit by Mother Nature during the last 2 years, wildfires, the Northridge earthquake, January's flood, and now this flooding. But California has not been beaten. That is because of the great fortitude, spirit, and can-do attitude of its people. I saw this spirit when I visited the town of Roseville in January, as neighbor helped neighbor cope with the tragedy of destroyed homes, possessions, and livelihoods.

I know these are difficult times for many Californians. My administration will do all that we can to help permit life to return to normalcy as soon as possible. James Lee Witt, our Federal Emergency Management Agency Director, has gotten all too familiar with California during the last 2 years. I am directing Director Witt and his staff to begin the flow of programs and to continue to perform its tele-registration and other outreach functions with the same enthusiasm and customer service orientation that we are now used to. I met some of those outreach people in January. They make us all proud.

State and local officials are working around the clock to rescue victims and fight the floods. And the American Red Cross is providing food, comfort, and shelter to those in need. Most importantly, the thousands of volunteers in communities throughout California are all working together in this difficult time. This community spirit is truly the best America has to offer.

Hillary and I send our thoughts and prayers to the families of those who have lost their lives. The thoughts and prayers of the American people are with them as well.

Remarks Honoring the 1994 NCAA Football Champion Nebraska Cornhuskers

March 13, 1995

Please be seated. Welcome to the White House on this beautiful morning. I am delighted to welcome all of the members of the national championship Nebraska Cornhuskers here, along with Chancellor Spanier, your athletic director Bill Byrne, and of course, Coach Osborne and all the players. I welcome the Nebraska congressional delegation: Senator Exon, Senator Kerrey, and Representatives Barrett, Bereuter, and Christensen. I do want to say a special word of regret, too, that Bob Devaney couldn't be here today, but we all wish him a very speedy recovery.

I have been, since I was a very small boy, an ardent college football fan. I know that Coach Osborne's record alone justifies a national championship, an 820 percent winning percentage. Most of us would like to have that here. *[Laughter]* Cornhuskers have been to a bowl game in each of his 22 years, and as I said when I called him the night Nebraska won, nobody deserves it more.

I want to congratulate your three first team All-Americans, linebacker Ed Stewart, tackle Zach Wiegert, and guard Brenden Stai, and also your three first-team Academic All-Americans, tackle Terry Connealy, tight end Matt Shaw, and the Academic All-American of the Year, who I just understood has never made a B, Rob Zatechka. We could give him a job here at the White House. It's sort of like praying for pro football.

I want to thank this team and this coach not only for winning the national championship—that's obviously a great honor—but for the way that it was won and the character and teamwork and spirit that Coach Osborne has always displayed and that this team displayed. I think it inspired people all across the country who are fans of athletics, and I think even people who are not great football fans or particularly knowledgeable about all the details, who read about the Nebraska team, who saw not only that you had three All-Americans but three Academic All-Americans, and who have followed the work of Tom Osborne over the years. It inspired them all to believe in the value of teamwork and sacrifice and discipline, and certainly you were rewarded in ways that were well justified.

I'd also like to say, I asked Coach Osborne on the way out if this was the largest football team ever to win a national championship, and he said, "Yes, but they're good students, too." I liked it because I felt this is the only—when those three guys walked out with me, this is the only football team in America that could make me look like a ballerina. *[Laughter]* I liked it.

So I welcome you here. I honor your achievement. We're delighted to have the players here. And I'd like to ask Coach Osborne to take the microphone now.

Coach?

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:51 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Graham Spanier, chancellor, and Bob Devaney, athletic director emeritus, University of Nebraska. Following the President's remarks, Coach Thomas Osborne made brief remarks, and the team presented the President with a team jersey and an autographed football.

Remarks to the National League of Cities

March 13, 1995

Thank you very much, Carolyn, for that warm introduction. And thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for the wonderful welcome you have given me. I'm glad to be here on this podium with all your officers, including

Mayor Lashutka of Columbus. Did I pronounce that right? Close? Lashutka.

I just had the Nebraska football team over at the White House, and so I had a lot of practice pronouncing names this morning. [Laughter] The Nebraska football team are so big, that's the only group of people in America I could stand with and look like the resident ballet dancer. [Laughter]

Mayor James, it's good to see you here, and all the other mayors who are here, and all of the other representatives of the cities and towns of our country.

I like to come here and meet with you because you deal with people at the level where you can have the greater contact with them. When I was Governor, nothing was more important to me than actually being able to spend a lot of time with the citizens at the grassroots community level who were interested in solving the problems of people. And I've always said that one of the things I like most about the job I used to have and one of the things I like least about the job I have now is that the closer you get to the people, the less political the work is, and the closer you get to Washington, the more political it becomes.

The most frustrating thing about being President is that I don't get enough time to speak with ordinary Americans in terms that they can understand about what we're trying to do up here. Although I must say, when I was driving up here today, I thought, these local officials may be out of touch, too. This is the most beautiful day we've had in Washington in 6 months, and here you are listening to a politician inside. [Laughter] I don't know.

You have the opportunity to see people struggling to keep the American dream alive everyday. And when you think of these issues, it must stun you at times what you hear in the news about what's going on up here, when it seems too rhetorical. Because I know when you think of these issues you know a name, you see a face, you know a life story. That gives meanings to the problems that we are dealing with. And I think Washington has suffered grievously from losing that connection, losing that touch with the people who sent us here, and trying to communicate with people from such a long way away over the mass media through so

many millions of conflicting messages with high levels of rhetoric.

I want to try to move back from that today and just to speak frankly about the choices that we face here and the choices that you face in doing your job and how we both can make the right decisions. As we stand on the edge of a new century and a new millennium, I think there are two great tasks facing America and our generation.

The first is to make sure that we enter the next century with the American dream alive and well for all of our people, for the middle class whose interests are so often forgotten, for those who are struggling to make it in the global economy, for all the poor people in this country who are working hard to play by the rules and to live up to their God-given capacity.

The second thing we have to do is to make sure we enter the next century making sure that America is still the strongest country on Earth, still the greatest force in the world for freedom and democracy and opportunity. There are two great threats to this endeavor. One is the stagnation of middle class economics. The other is the erosion of mainstream values.

And the third thing that I want to talk to you about is the fact that the Government has often made these problems worse, not better, in the last several years. So we have to ask ourselves, what can we do to restore middle class economics, the opportunity part of the American dream? And what can we do to restore mainstream values, the responsibility part of the American dream? And what kind of Government changes do we need here to make sure we're good partners with the American people where you live and work?

For the last 20 years, most people have worked the same hours or even longer hours, for the same or even lower wages. There is a new class of permanently poor people, mostly young women and their small children, and they're growing. And the anxieties of people are pronounced, economically. Even in this time of economic recovery, people worry about downsizing everywhere and whether they really count in the workplace anymore. And there is a huge inequality growing among our workers, where those

with good education and those capable of learning new skills tend to get good jobs with growing incomes and those without tend to be stuck in a rut forever.

We have all this good news. We had—in 1993, we haven't gotten the '94 figures yet—in '93 we had the largest number of new businesses started in the United States of America in any year in our history, and that's something to be proud of. But we also see people struggling just to hold on and to maintain their lifestyle, even though in many families both the husband and the wife are working and having less and less time to spend with their children.

On the social front, the values we all cherish, work and family and community, are threatened as crime and violence and drug use rises all across America. And even when it falls, it's still too high. The rate of children that are born out of wedlock continues to go up. Our social problems, in many ways, seem more profound today than they have in a long time.

And you see the traditions of breakdown in family, community, rooted in a loss of allegiance to these mainstream values and a lack of opportunity. This is a dangerous erosion of the things that made America great and kept us strong for over 200 years.

We are now in the midst of a great debate here in Washington about what we ought to do about this. How can we make the good things more present and how can we reduce the bad things in America? How can we do the things we need to do to keep the American dream alive and keep our country strong? How we answer these questions will say an awful lot about what kind of people we're going to be and what kind of country we're going to pass on to our children in the 21st century.

There is on one side of the debate, on the extreme, the old and now discredited Washington view that a big, bureaucratic, one-size-fits-all Government can provide big solutions to all America's big problems and maybe to some of America's not so big problems.

The other extreme is the view of the Republican contract, that Government is the source of all the problems, and if we could just get rid of it completely or at least reduce the Federal Government's spending role,

every problem in America would miraculously solve itself.

I have a different view, and it's probably rooted in the fact that I didn't live and work here until 2 years ago. My view is rooted in the fact that my experiences as a Governor of a small State are much more like yours than they are like most of the people who make most of the decisions in this community. I think we have to chart a course between and beyond the old way of big Government and the new rage of no Government.

No great country can survive without a National Government that in the information age is more limited but is still strong and effective. We do have, after all, common problems as a people. We have common opportunities. And these require a common response. We need the Government, in short, to be a partner with people in their private lives as citizens, a partner with State and local government, a partner with all of us.

I believe in a Government that promotes opportunity and demands responsibility, that deals with middle class economics and mainstream values, a Government that is different radically from the one we have known here over the last 30 to 40 years but that still understands it has a role to play in order for us to build strong communities that are the bedrock of this Nation. That's what the New Covenant I talk about all the time is really all about, more opportunity and more responsibility.

Our job is to work together to grow the middle class, to shrink the under class, to expand opportunity and to shrink bureaucracy, to empower people to make the most of their own lives. We can't give any guarantees in this rapidly changing world, but we can give people the capacity to do for themselves. And we must do that; all of us must do it.

And finally we have to work to enhance our security on our own streets and around the world. I believe, in short, that the role of this Government is to be a partner in the fight for the future, not a saviour—it can't be that—but not a spectator on the sidelines either. We've tried that, and it didn't work out very well.

We must face the fact that we live in a certain historical period in which the economy is global, the information age means that

the basis of most wealth in the future will be knowledge, and that we can be far more decentralized and flexible than we ever have been before. No one will ever again have to rely on a distant bureaucracy to solve every problem in today's rapidly changing environment.

We have to focus more on equipping people with the resources they need to tackle their own problems and to give people the responsibility to determine how best to do that. We have to send more and more decisions back, not only to State and local government but to citizens themselves.

We must cut spending. We must cut Government. But I believe we must also invest more in jobs, incomes, technology, education, and training. That's what will make us wealthy.

I ran for President because I felt these challenges were not being met, because I felt that there was no economic strategy for putting our people first. We had 12 years of trickle-down economics in which the deficit quadrupled and our future was mortgaged. But we didn't invest in our people or our economy. We had both less opportunity and less responsibility. In Washington all I ever heard was the blame game. And it often reminded me of—I felt often when I was out there in the country like you, like people must feel in a jury box, you know when two lawyers get in an argument with a judge over what they can say or not? All the jury wants to know is who did it. *[Laughter]*

And the American people, what they want to know is, what are we going to do? And are we going to do? And so I ran for this job because I was tired of a system in which both middle class economics and mainstream values were suffering. And the Government was doing well by special interest but not the public interest. I felt very strongly that we had to do something to stop the conditions in which most Americans were living, where people were working harder and harder and harder for less and less and less security. And I still believe that's what we ought to be about.

Now, we have begun to change all that. We have begun to change all that. And it required some pretty tough decisions, some of them were unpopular. Some of the people

who made those unpopular decisions lost their seats in Congress last year, because people were told for years and years and years they could have a free lunch, that there were no tough decisions to be made.

Everything here operated at the level of rhetoric. We got down to business. They talked about cutting the deficit. We did, by \$600 billion. And we did it with over a quarter of a trillion dollars in spending cuts, with income tax increases on the wealthiest 1.2 percent of our people, with discipline—not by the way, because I think that's good thing to do but because they were the ones best able to pay. And those were the people who were benefiting most economically from the economy.

And at the same, we were cutting 300 domestic programs. We were also providing tax relief for 15 million working families who were working at or near the poverty line to make sure that nobody who works 40 hours a week with children in their home should ever live in poverty. It's the biggest incentive to stay off welfare to know that if you work hard and you raise your kids, you're going to be able to make a living wage. These are the things that we worked on.

Now, we eliminated or consolidated or cut about 300 programs. And in this new budget that I've got—we'll talk more about that in a minute—we propose to eliminate or consolidate 400 more. We reduced the size of the Federal work force in 2 years by over 100,000. And if no new laws pass—*[applause]*—thank you. If no new laws pass, the work force will be reduced over a 6-year period to its smallest size since John Kennedy was President. It will be 272,000 fewer people working here than on the day I was inaugurated President. I'm proud of that.

We have shifted power away from Washington to more responsibility for States and counties and cities and towns. The Vice President has lead our reinventing Government initiative, which has already saved the taxpayers \$63 billion and will save more. We've already cut regulations in banking and intrastate trucking and many other areas that make it now easier for businesses to create jobs and create opportunities. And we must do more, and we will. We've worked too hard to try to make it easier for you to do your

jobs and to improve the lives of the people that we both serve.

Now, we've done a lot of other things, as well, that often get lost in the smoke around here. We passed the family leave law after 6 years of arguing about it. We passed the crime bill after 6 years of arguing about it. We expanded Head Start and provided for the immunization of all children under 2 by 1996. And we made lower cost, better repayment college loans available to 20 million young Americans so more people could go to college. We were busy around here in the last 2 years.

And along the way we were able to pass two major trade agreements, resolve major trade disputes with China and other countries, and expand trade by more than at any time in a generation. Very important when you consider the fact that low-cost goods from other countries come into our open markets if we have no trade agreements, but the trade agreements open markets for high value-added American goods and American services and American jobs all around the world.

I say this to point out how much different it is where you live than where we live. If you had done that, your voters would know it, right? *[Laughter]* And all the nay-sayers said, "Oh, if they put this economic plan in, it'll be the worst thing that ever happened to the country. The economy will collapse immediately. Everything will be terrible." Now they're all going to New Hampshire and giving the same speech all over again. *[Laughter]* I heard it for 2 years.

You know, since no country has permanent growth, if they keep predicting a recession, eventually we'll get around to it. *[Laughter]* They said, "Oh, this is a terrible thing—if they pass this program, oh, it's terrible. The economy will just—it'll be terrible."

Well, what's happened in the last 2 years? We've got the lowest combined rate of unemployment and inflation in 25 years because we took it on. Over 6.1 million Americans have new jobs in the last 2 years. That is a good beginning.

Now, having said all that, let's face the facts. You live with these folks, and you know as well as I do, there are still profound problems out there. Most people still have not

gotten a raise. Every year more and more people lose their health insurance even though they're in the work force. This is the only advanced country in the world that has a smaller percentage of people in the work force covered by health insurance in 1995 than had it in 1985. No other country can say that.

And we know these other problems are still with us. Half of all Americans are living on less money than they had 15 years ago. So we now have to focus not only on creating jobs but raising incomes and improving the security of working life and family life when people do the right thing. If we're going to strengthen the middle class and shrink the under class, we have got to do those things which will enable people to really feel the American dream. We've got to begin by equipping people with the skills they need to compete in today's economy. Even as we cut yesterday's Government, we must invest more in the education and training of our people. We must. We must.

We have tried to approach that work as the partner of people at the local level. Most folks around here think last year was the best year for education legislation passing through Congress in 30 years as we expanded Head Start and provided more funds for apprenticeships for young people who don't go onto college and made those college loans more affordable and wrote into Federal law the Goals 2000, the world-class standards for our schools.

But we changed the way we were making education law in Washington pretty dramatically. We didn't neglect our responsibilities to help create educational opportunity, but we didn't presume to tell the people at the grassroots level how to meet the standards as the Government had done so much in the past. Instead, we gave to local educators and to parents the power to decide how to meet global standards of excellence.

We said, here are some things that have to be done to improve our children's education. Here are things we'd like to do to help you do it. But you decide how to do it. In many ways, in dealing more directly with city government, our empowerment zones and enterprise communities are the embodiment of that kind of approach: to cre-

ate opportunity, to shrink bureaucracy, to demand more responsibility, and then let you decide what you want to do with it and how you can best create jobs and opportunities.

We said to distressed communities, give us a comprehensive plan to create jobs, to revitalize neighborhoods, to bring the community together, to involve the private sector. Find the solutions together. The opportunity you get will be some cash money and tax incentives to encourage investment and resources to deal with other problems, like transportation or safety. And we'll cut the redtape so you can apply those resources as you see fit. This is a partnership between government, the private sector, and communities to encourage investment, to create jobs in places where too many people have been left completely behind.

If you think about it, our country has had major initiatives in the last several years to invest in Latin America, to invest in the Caribbean, to invest in all different kinds of places. They're fine. But this is the first major initiative we've had to get people to invest in America, to create jobs and markets and our best opportunities.

And by the way, I hope that before this session is over, we will see an expansion of that program, not a contraction of it, one that is paid for, one that is funded, but we ought to work to expand it, to involve more communities. We had hundreds of communities wanting to be involved in it who had good proposals that could not be funded.

We have to recognize that if we want people to live by the work ethic, there must be work for them to do. That also is something we should remember as we deal with the next issue that is coming in this session of Congress that affects some of you more than others, depending on how the system operates in your State, but all of you in some ways, and that is, how are we going to fix the welfare system? I believe we should offer more opportunity in the form of education and work to people on welfare and then insist on more responsibility, requiring work after 2 years, tougher child support enforcement, responsible parenting. I've been working on this issue—[applause]—I've been working on this issue for 15 years now, and I know that Washington doesn't have all the answers and

neither does anybody else, or we'd have solved it by now.

But we have done our best here to give more and more and more authority to conduct sweeping welfare reform efforts to the States. We have given 25 States waivers from the Federal rules and regulations to pursue welfare reform. Today we will give a waiver to Oklahoma, the 26th State to pursue a welfare reform proposal. That is more combined shift of power from the Federal Government to the States than occurred under my two predecessors, combined. I believe in this. I believe in this.

I know that the Government shouldn't dictate all the rules from Washington. On the other hand, I don't think we should give States welfare money without any standards at all. We do have a national interest in promoting work and responsible parenting, the reduction of out of wedlock births. We have a national interest in doing this.

Last year, I sent to Congress the most sweeping welfare reform plan ever proposed by an administration. It included the toughest possible child support enforcement. Let me just mention child support for a minute. Do you know if we collected all the money owed in this country by deadbeat parents, we could move 800,000 mothers and children off the welfare rolls immediately, 800,000.

Now, one of the things that we have reached agreement with the Congress on is that in this area there has to be some national standard setting, because 30 percent of these cases cross States lines. So even though we want to move decisions back to the States, when the Governors came to town, they said, "Look, we know we've got to have some national action on child support and enforcement. Otherwise we can't ever collect on these orders that cross State lines. Justice should not depend solely on geography."

Reforming welfare is now a top priority for both parties, and that's good news. And we've worked together to find common solutions, and that's good news. We still have our differences. My plan and the one our administration has been behind for over a year now sends a clear message to young people. It says, take responsibility to turn your life around. Teen fathers must pay child support. Teen mothers should stay at home or in other

appropriate settings, and they have to stay in school if they want to get a check.

But the Republican plan sends a different message at some points. It says, for example, if you make a mistake before you're 18, and you have a baby, you're on your own. No benefits for teenagers and their children who have babies before they're 18, until they turn 18, and then if the States want to keep them out of benefits forever, that's okay. I think that's a mistake. I think what we ought to be saying to people is, "You should not have done that. You make a mistake. We don't want anybody else to do it. But we're going to help you succeed as a student and a parent and a worker, and you have to help yourself by playing by these rules." I think that is a better approach. And I think it's in your interest.

Look, when people get—if we just cut people off without putting them to work or keeping them in school, without making sure they have child care, if we just end all this, well, the Federal Government will save a little money. And you know what will happen, don't you? They'll be on your doorstep. They won't be part of some Federal statistic, and people say, "Oh, we're not spending money on that up here like we used to. We'll just give you the problem, and you figure out what to do with it."

Well, my own view is that just shifting the problem is not enough. Like many of the cuts currently being debated, I think it will ultimately be counterproductive. It will cost us more than we will save. The Federal Government, the cities, the States, the taxpayers all will pay more down the road if we do something that fundamentally undermines the health of our children, the future of our children, and our commitment to getting more Americans to live with the opportunities of middle class economics and the responsibilities of mainstream values. That's what I believe.

Now, yes, yes, we do have to continue to cut the deficit. We do have to continue to save money. My new budget cuts the deficit another \$81 billion and has over \$140 billion in spending cuts. And I want to work with the Republicans to do more. We have already reduced the rate of health care cost increases in the Federal budget over the next 5 years

by \$100 billion. We have to keep working on the deficit.

But we have to do it in the right way. One of the things that the Republican leadership and I agree on is the line-item veto. We're about to take up debate on the line-item veto in the Senate. I hope it will pass quickly because it will give the President the opportunity and the responsibility to look at every single line item in the budget for waste. It will give us the chance to cut pork without hurting people. And that is an important distinction.

Let me give you an example of what I mean. Everybody knows we have to shrink the Department of Agriculture. Ross Perot had the best line of any of the candidates in the 1992 election. It grieves me to say that, but he did. *[Laughter]* Ross Perot had this great line where he said, "Did you hear about the employee at the Department of Agriculture that had to go see a psychiatrist because he lost his farmer?" *[Laughter]* And what he meant by that was, of course, that the number of farmers was shrinking and that technology and the modern world had reduced the need for some of the size and scope of organization of the Agriculture Department. So we all wanted to do that. Everybody knows we've got to save money.

One of the reasons I fought so hard for that GATT world trade agreement is so we could cut agricultural subsidies here without hurting our farmers in the global market. So my budget cuts agricultural subsidies, but now our competitors have to cut theirs more to give our people a fair break.

I'll give you another example. We wanted to cut the Agriculture Department, so we just closed 1,200 offices, 1,200. That's a lot of money. I do not think the way to cut the Agriculture Department is to freeze the school lunch program and send it to you, which means we're going to cut school lunches as the price of food goes up and the number of kids goes up. I don't agree with that.

And you cannot make me believe with all the poor kids in this world today and in this country who show up hungry to school every day, whose only decent meal occurs in school, you cannot make me believe that we cannot find a way to eliminate unnecessary

spending from the Government budget without cutting the school lunch program. We can, and we will. We will.

I'll give you another example that affects a lot of you here. Some in Congress want to eliminate our community development bank initiative. Most of you probably have never heard of that, but let me tell you what it does. It's an initiative that would spend \$500 million to either establish or support banks that are set up in economically distressed areas, whose primary purpose is to get lower income people in high unemployment areas into the free enterprise system.

Now, I found out about this a few years ago when I was in Chicago, when I had a friend working for the South Shore Development Corporation. And we set up a community development bank in Arkansas when I was Governor that operated in a rural area, and it did amazing things. People got credit who could never get credit from any bank before, and they set up businesses, and they started working, and they started hiring people. And it changed lives for a lot of people in these communities.

So when I ran for President, I said here's a good idea that came out of grassroots America. We could put a little money in it and make a lot of difference. It is estimated that the \$500 million that we could spend on the community development bank initiative in your communities all over the country will generate \$22 billion in activity in the free enterprise system in places that have no enterprise today. So I think it would be a mistake to eliminate it. That's what I believe.

Believe you me, there's a lot of Government programs that don't have that kind of return. And keep in mind, what is the purpose of the Government? It's to empower people to make the most of their own lives, to enhance their security, and to help create opportunity as a partner. That's what this does.

I'll give you another example of the things that I don't think should be cut. Our national service project, AmeriCorps, is all about opportunity and responsibility. A lot of you have AmeriCorps projects in your communities. Young people get a helping hand with their college in exchange for helping people solve their problems at the local community.

Thousands of young people now are participants, as partners, as nurses, as teachers, working with pastors, working with police officers at the grassroots level. They walk police beats in Brooklyn. They build homes in Georgia. They fight fires in Idaho. But some people in the House want to cut this effort, to deny 15,000 young people the chance to participate in it. Now I've offered spending cuts, and I'll find some more. But I think it is a mistake to cut AmeriCorps because it's a good deal. It gives us better citizens, stronger communities, more education for limited money. And it enables a lot of people to do things in their communities that simply would not get done any other way.

Ironically, one other area where we're having a big difference of opinion is in college loans. There's some in the Congress who want to severely limit the reach of the so-called direct loan program that we started which, believe it or not, lowers the cost of the loans to the students, cuts the time of paperwork and bureaucracy to the colleges, and saves money for the taxpayers because we get around the middle man. So here's one area where we can do more to send people to school for lower cost and actually save money. We've offered millions and millions of young people the opportunity to take these loans out and then pay them back as a percentage of their income.

But I want to emphasize that we've also been more responsible than Government was before. When I took office it was costing you as taxpayers, \$2.8 billion a year to pay tax money for defaulted loans. We have cut that \$2.8 billion down to \$1 billion. We've cut it by nearly two-thirds and made more loans available so people can go to college. That's the approach we ought to be taking. That is the way to save money on the program.

Now, one last thing in this area that I'm very concerned about, in the education area, and that is that one of the things in the House list of rescissions to cut is all the money for safe and drug-free schools that would go to 94 percent of the schools in this country. And that's very important to me, personally. I invested a lot of time in fighting the problem of drugs when I was a Governor. We have worked hard to get more investment to fight drugs in every area in which we fight it here,

since I've been President. And we see disturbing signs that in parts of our population, among young people, drug use is going up again, more casual drug use, young people thinking, after a decade of it going down, that somehow it's maybe not dangerous anymore, forgetting that it's illegal. And a lot of our schools are still not safe because of the root problems of drugs and violence. Now this money gives schools the ability to hire police officers, to put up metal detectors, but also to have drug education programs, the programs like the D.A.R.E. program that so many of you have had in your schools and others that try and help these kids stay off drugs. I think it would be a mistake to cut this money out.

Let me remind you that this money got into the crime bill, which you worked so hard for, because I gave the Congress, for the first time, a plan to cut the size of the Federal Government by 270,000. So we didn't raise any taxes. We didn't take any money away from anybody. We shrunk the Government and gave the money to the communities of this country to fight crime, including the safe and drug-free schools money. We should not eliminate that. We should fight for it, not fight to cut it out.

As we are trying, you and I, to make responsibility a way of life in this country again, to teach young people the value of work, I think that all of us are going to have to say, first of all, without regard to our party, we agree with that.

Now that brings me to one other point I want to make beyond education. When I was a child, my mother used to say, "Idle hands are the devil's workshop." You're going to have a whole lot more idle hands this summer if we cut out those 600,000 summer jobs for our young people. And is it worth it to deny 1,000 young people in Louisville or 1,600 young people in Boston—I met with a young—the Mayor's Youth Council up there not very long ago, 2,000 in the San Jose area. Is it worth it to deny them the chance to work, to be around responsible adults, to learn what it's like to sort of show up on time, put a day's work in, how you relate to other people at work? I mean, this goes way beyond the little amount of money you get out of this.

Now, I have proposed, I will say again, to consolidate 60 programs and eliminate 4,000 bureaucrats to save money in the Housing and Urban Development Department, for example. I have proposed to do a lot of things like that.

I told you about the Agriculture Department. We're coming with more. Hold on; every week, there will be more. I am not here to defend the way Government has operated in the past in Washington. But we have to make judgments here. We get hired to make judgments and the right decisions and not to throw out the baby with the bath water.

Take the HUD Department, for example, I'm all for—I'm consolidating 60 programs. We're getting rid of 4,000 people. We're phasing the Department down. But I don't believe in the proposed cut to housing assistance that helps 63,000 families—women with small children, low-income senior citizens.

What we ought to do is to look at the right kind of cuts. This whole rescission package does some interesting things. We're supposed to be passing responsibility back to you, but not undermining your ability to do your job.

I think it's smarter to streamline programs and cut bureaucrats than to put families on the street or to leave you to deal with the problem. Many of the people willing to pass you the buck are talking about ending unfair burdens on local government. I do want to say this: I think—and the Speaker probably said this earlier today—it looks like we may have an agreement now among all of the conferees and the administration and everybody on this unfunded mandate bill. I am very strongly in favor of that. It is a good thing to do. It's something we should do.

It is long since past time to stop imposing those mandates on you without paying for them. I spent a decade in the Governor's office in Arkansas, writing checks for decisions other people made. Now, I'm excited about that. That bill just passed the House a few weeks ago. It passed the Senate. It's a good, good thing.

But look at this: The rescission package that's moving through the Congress actually cuts off funds to help you comply with present Federal requirements, including safe

drinking water, lead paint, and asbestos removal. So that makes them, I guess, not unfunded, but de-funded mandates. [Laughter] So we eliminate burdens on the one hand and create new ones on the other. I think that is an error.

Let me mention just one final area where we worked closely last year. We passed the crime bill after the people who were here before just talked about it for 6 years, played politics with it, and the rhetoric was so juicy on both sides they could never get around to passing a bill. That's what always happens, you know?

Every one of these issues are tough. If they were easy, somebody would have done them. And you could pick either side and say it in a way that a majority is for you, right? I mean, you can. Are you for a balanced budget? Yes. Do you want to cut Social Security? No. [Laughter] See what I mean? So both sides win, right? Meanwhile, you're like the jurors listening to the lawyers' argument. Well, what's going to happen? Who did it? So we've got to work on this.

But I want to say this about the crime bill. We finally did that. And what we did largely was what was recommended by law enforcement officials and community leaders around the country: money for prevention with a lot of flexibility for people at the local level; tougher punishment, but help for States that would adopt tougher punishment, to build more prisons; and of course, more police, 100,000 more police on the street.

We did that because of two things. First of all, the law enforcement people said, we need more police. They also said they wanted a prevention fund. Secondly, we did it because of the evidence of what happens when community policing is properly instituted in the cities of our country.

From over about the last 30 years, the number of police in our country had grown by only about 10 percent, while the violent crime rate tripled. Clearly, there is a connection between those two statistics. And yet, still we've seen in place after place, where more police are put on the street in community policing modes, the crime rate will drop. That's why every major law enforcement organization supported that.

Now, the congressional bills and the crime bill are different from the House and Senate, but I ask you to look at the system we have now and the work it did, not only to catch criminals but to prevent crime. In New York City, the police commissioner implemented an aggressive community policing program that helped to significantly reduce serious crimes last year: auto thefts down 15 percent, robberies down 16 percent, murder down 19 percent. Not just in big cities: The mayor of Odessa, Texas, wrote to tell me that in 1991 and '92, they had a very high crime rate. Then they implemented community policing, and 3 years later, serious crimes have dropped a total of 43 percent. Union City, Tennessee, calls for help from the police went down by 30 percent and arrests went up by 35 percent with community policing.

That's why this crime bill was a partnership to help communities willing to take the responsibility to invest in their own security be more secure. An opportunity that is buried in redtape can hurt more than it helps. I don't know how many times I've seen little towns in my State have to hire consultants to figure out how to get Federal money, and it cut the margin of benefit dramatically.

What we did was to set this police program up so that cities and counties can apply directly to the Federal Government, using a one-page application with eight questions, awarding police resources directly to you. Now, I think that's a pretty good deal. I know one of those bills wants to add another layer to that. I don't think that's a very good idea, either. I think that we ought to have an opportunity for communities to apply directly and get the funds directly for law enforcement. My fellow Governors may disagree with that, but that's what I think.

Now, in just the last few months since the crime bill took effect last fall, half the police departments in America have already received authority to hire almost 17,000 new police officers. We are ahead of schedule, and we're under budget. Some people who criticize our bill said that local governments wouldn't really want it; it was too much of a burden; it's an imposition; they can't afford to pay any match. All I know is, we have already received almost 11,000 applications representing over 60 percent of the police

departments in America. Somebody thinks it's a good idea, and I think we ought to stay with it.

Here's the bottom line: The crime bill now on the books guarantees 100,000 new police officers. The alternative proposal doesn't guarantee a single one. We do give more flexibility and responsibility to you. Some of their proposals add bureaucracy and cut funds at the same time. So I say to you, if it ain't broke, don't fix it.

We should never, never close the door to writing new laws that will make us more secure in the fight against crime. And it should never be a partisan issue again. I was sick when I got here 2 years ago and I realized they'd been fooling around with that crime bill for 4 years because each side could figure out how to gain rhetorical advantage. And small differences obscured large agreements. So I want to continue to work on this problem.

But this police initiative is a better deal for you and a better deal for the American people. And as I have said repeatedly, if necessary, I will veto any effort to repeal or undermine it.

But let me say this, what we need is not more vetoes. What we need is more action. What we need is for people here to behave the way you have to behave or you couldn't survive. Half of you come from places so small that if you made people declare their party every time they walked through the door to see if they got anything done or not, you'd be run out on a rail within a week. [Laughter]

So, the veto is a useful device and an important thing on occasion. But what the country really needs is action. We need action. We need to remember these problems have faces, names, and life histories. We need to pull together. We're doing it on the unfunded mandates. We can do it on the line-item veto. We can do it on all these other areas if we will exercise simple common sense and recognize what our mission is. We've got to keep the American dream alive: middle class economics, mainstream values, jobs, incomes, work, and family. We've got to make sure this country stays strong.

And I'm telling you, it takes action, not just words. You live where the action is. If

you don't do anything else while you're here, give us your energy and tell us you want action.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:02 p.m. at the Washington Hilton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Carolyn Long Banks, president, National League of Cities; Mayor Greg Lashutka of Columbus, OH; and Mayor Sharpe James of Newark, NJ. A portion of these remarks could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Executive Order 12956—Israel-United States Binational Industrial Research and Development Foundation

March 13, 1995

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including section 1 of the International Organizations Immunities Act (22 U.S.C. 288), and having found that the Israel-United States Binational Industrial Research and Development Foundation is a public international organization in which the United States participates within the meaning of the International Organizations Immunities Act, I hereby designate the Israel-United States Binational Industrial Research and Development Foundation as a public international organization entitled to enjoy the privileges, exemptions, and immunities conferred by the International Organizations Immunities Act. This designation is not intended to abridge in any respect the privileges, exemptions, or immunities that such organization may have acquired or may acquire by international agreements or by congressional action.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
March 13, 1995.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 9:18 a.m., March 14, 1995]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the *Federal Register* on March 15.

Proclamation 6776—National Public Health Week, 1995

March 13, 1995

*By the President of the United States
of America*

A Proclamation

A clean bill of health is one of life's most precious gifts. But for many Americans, and for millions around the world, good health can seem almost a luxury. The AIDS epidemic, the prevalence of poor nutrition, unplanned pregnancies, and environmental degradation—these are just some of the pressing crises facing hardworking public health officials everywhere. While our society's medical technology has advanced to a level unimaginable to the generations before, the crucial job of ensuring basic public health for all remains just beyond our reach.

Now, more than ever, public health programs and services are needed so that we can ensure the best possible health for everyone. Providing safe living and working environments, developing methods to immunize populations against infectious disease, maintaining good nutritional standards, and having good prenatal care for everyone are vital endeavors—and such primary and preventive measures can mean the difference between life and death.

Every day, thousands of individuals across our country are working to build healthy communities, meet the needs of our diverse population, plan appropriate responses to natural disasters, educate individuals about workplace hazards, and encourage responsible behavior in all that we do. Their leadership is helping America to address one of humanity's most essential concerns, and their service is building a safer, healthier future for all of our people.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim the week of April 3 through April 9, 1995, as "National Public Health Week." I call upon all Federal, State, and local public health agencies to join with appropriate private organizations and educational institutions in celebrating this occa-

sion with activities to promote healthy lifestyles and to heighten awareness of the many benefits good health brings.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this thirteenth day of March, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-five, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and nineteenth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 2:28 p.m., March 13, 1995]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on March 15.

Memorandum on Assistance to Victims of the Conflict in Chechnya

March 13, 1995

Presidential Determination No. 95-16

Memorandum for the Secretary of State

Subject: Determination Pursuant to Section 2(c)(1) of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962, as Amended

Pursuant to section 2(c)(1) of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962, as amended, 22 U.S.C. 2601(c)(1), I hereby determine that it is important to the national interest that up to \$11,000,000 be made available from the U.S. Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund to meet the urgent and unexpected needs of victims of the conflict in Chechnya. These funds may be used as necessary to provide U.S. contributions in response to the appeals of international and intergovernmental organizations for funds to meet the urgent and unforeseen humanitarian needs of victims of the conflict in Chechnya.

You are authorized and directed to inform the appropriate committees of the Congress of this determination and the obligation of funds under this authority and to publish this memorandum in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 4:54 p.m., March 20, 1995]

NOTE: This memorandum will be published in the *Federal Register* on March 22.

Remarks and a Question-and-Answer Session With the National PTA Legislative Conference

March 14, 1995

The President. Thank you very much, Kathryn. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. I am delighted to be here with you. More importantly, I am delighted to have you here with me. I need all the help I can get. [Laughter] I feel like reinforcements have just arrived.

I want to say, too, a special word of thanks to the PTA for presenting Secretary Riley the PTA Child Advocacy Award tomorrow. He's here with me. And I think he's done a magnificent job. And I thank you for giving him that award.

Such a beautiful sort of premature spring day outside. I almost feel that we should be having recess instead of class. [Laughter] But unfortunately, events compel us to have class, for we are in danger of forgetting some of our most fundamental lessons.

I want to start by thanking a kindergarten class taught by Linda Eddington from Jackson Hole, Wyoming, for the wonderful letters they sent up here with her. I reviewed the letters. I had some favorites. Charlie Wheeler said, "You are a good paper-writer, because you practice." My favorite letter, regrettably, was unsigned, otherwise I would be writing a letter back. It said, "You're one of the best. I never have seen you, but I like your speeches." I am sending to the Congress today a proposal to lower the voting age to 5. [Laughter] We might get better results.

I want to thank the PTA for now nearly 100 years of help to children and to parents and to schools. The PTA has meant a lot to me personally. I have been a member of the PTA—Hillary and I both were active when I was the Governor of Arkansas. Essie used to come sell me my membership every year. [Laughter] And I actually paid and actually—[laughter]. You know how Presidents never carry any money anywhere they go? I brought some money today, because I knew she was going to be here. [Laughter] I did.

I also, besides being an active member of the PTA and spending a lot of time at Chelsea's school, had a chance to work with the PTA for a dozen years in my State and throughout the country as we worked to implement the recommendations of the Nation at Risk Report, starting in '83. And then we worked up to the national education goals in '89. And then, of course, ultimately culminating in my service as President in the last 2 years.

At a time when many of our most important citizenship organizations have been suffering and civic institutions generally are often in decline, the PTA has grown as parents have come back in droves to understanding that they had to do more to make their children's education work and that they had to be involved. PTA embodies the three ideas that I have talked about so much for the future—opportunity, responsibility, and community—what we call the New Covenant.

This is a period of profound change in the life of America and in the lives of Americans. There are many things going on which are wonderful, exhilarating, exciting, and others which are profoundly troubling. The biggest challenges we face on the eve of this new century relate to our economic and social problems, which threaten the middle class economics of the American dream and the mainstream values of work and family and community. We see it everywhere in every community. About half of the American people are making the same or less money than they made 15 years ago. We have an enormous divide opening up within the great American middle class based largely on the level of education. And in spite of the fact that—and I'm very proud of the fact—that we've had an economic recovery that has produced the lowest rates of unemployment and inflation combined in 25 years and 6.1 million new jobs, a whole lot of Americans are still worried about losing theirs or losing the benefits associated with their job, their health care, their retirement, or never getting a raise. And in spite of the progress we are making on many fronts, there is still an awful lot of social turmoil in this country from drugs and violence and gangs and family

breakdown. And these things are profoundly troubling to the American people.

So we have a lot of good news and a lot of bad news. And a whole lot is happening. In 1993 we had the largest number of new businesses started in the United States in any single year in the history of the country. So we're all trying to work through this as a people, as we must. I believe our common mission must be to keep the American dream alive for all of our people as we move into the next century and to make sure our country is still the strongest force for peace and freedom and democracy in the world. To do that, we've got to have a strong economy. We've got to be able to grow the middle class and shrink the under class. We have to support all these wonderful entrepreneurial forces that are bubbling up in our society. We have to dramatically change the way Government works. But our goal must be always, always the same: to make sure that every American has the chance to live up to his or her God-given potential. And that is what the PTA is all about.

Education has always been profoundly important in American life, from the very beginning. Thomas Jefferson talked about it a lot. But it has never been more important to the prosperity and, indeed, to the survival of the America we know and love than it is today, never.

Now, as we move away from the cold war and the industrial age into the post-cold-war era and the information age where most wealth generation is based on knowledge and technology is changing things at a blinding pace, we know that there will be big changes and there must be in the role of Government. There's a huge debate going on here in Washington, which can be seen in almost every issue, about exactly what the role of the Government should be as we move toward the 21st century. On the one side is the largely rejected view that Washington still knows best about everything and that there is a one-size-fits-all big answer to every big problem in the country. On the other side is what you might call the Republican contract view, which is that the Government is the source of all the problems in the country, and if we just had no Government, we'd have no problems, and—unless something is going

on at the State and local level that they don't agree with, in which case they want Federal action. But, basically, that's the argument stated in the most extreme forms.

I believe that the truth is somewhere both in between and way beyond that. I believe we have common problems that require common approaches. I believe we need a Government in Washington that is leaner but not meaner, one that does not pretend to be the savior of the country but does not presume to sit on the sidelines, either, one that, instead, is a partner in working with the American people to increase opportunity while we shrink bureaucracy, to empower people to make the most of their own lives, and to enhance the security of the American people, both here at home on our streets and around the world. I believe that such a Government would promote both opportunity and responsibility. And I believe that such a Government should have clear priorities that put the interests of the American people first, the interests of all the American people.

Now, there are strong feelings on both sides of this debate. And a lot of what is said may be hard to follow. But I think it's important that we keep in mind what is really the issue. The issue is, how are we going to get this country into the 21st century? How are we going to give our children and our grandchildren a chance to live out the unlimited aspirations of the human spirit and to fulfill the traditions of America.

Now, let's look at this thing on an issue-by-issue basis. There is broad agreement that we should cut the size of Government, that we should send more responsibility back to the State and local level, and that we should work more in partnership directly with citizens, with businesses, with other organizations and less in a regulatory Government-knows-best way. There is broad agreement on this. Indeed, we started this movement.

But the question is, how do you implement these challenges, and what does the Government still have to do? For example, I believe we should downsize the Government, but I think we should invest more in education, training, technology, and research. Why? Because I think it's in our interest. It looks to me like walking away from our opportunities to succeed in the global economy and to de-

velop the capacities of all of our people at a time when we have so much diversity in our country and the world is getting smaller, so all this racial and ethnic diversity is a huge advantage to us. At a time when we have people who have phenomenal abilities who live all over the country in tiny, tiny places and big, big cities, to walk away from our common objective of developing their capacities, it seems to me, is not very smart. I just don't think it makes much sense. And I don't think that any theory of what we should or shouldn't be doing should be allowed to obscure the clear obligation we all have to help our people get into the next century. This is about a fight for the future.

Now, let me put it another way. It seems to me like trying to cut back on education right now would be like trying to cut the defense budget in the toughest days of the cold war. Because that's what—our competition for the future, our security now is going to be determined in large measure by whether we can develop the capacities of all of our people to learn for a lifetime. That is it.

For the 12 years before I came here, there was this political tug of war where Government was regularly bashed but the deficit quadrupled and we walked away from our obligations to invest in our future. For the 4 years before I came here, we had the slowest job growth in America since the Great Depression. For 2 years, we have worked very hard here to both create more opportunities and insist on more responsibilities. And we're making progress. The deficit is down. The Federal Government is smaller by over 100,000. We're on our way to the smallest Federal Government since Mr. Kennedy was the President. We have more jobs, more police on the street, more prosperity than when I took office. And we have invested more in our children.

In the last 2 years, we have, I believe, had the best year in terms of legislative advancements for education that we've had in 30 years. And I might say it was done in a largely bipartisan way. We expanded and reformed Head Start. We passed an apprenticeship program for young people who don't go on to 4-year colleges but do want to move into good jobs after high school. We made college loans more affordable and the repayment

terms better for millions and millions of middle class and lower income students. We made a new commitment to help you to get drugs and guns out of our schools and to end the mindless violence that too many of our children still suffer from. And of course, with your help, we passed Goals 2000, something that was very, very important to me and very important to you. And it's a clear example of Government as a partner, not a savior and not on the sidelines.

No one disagrees with the fact that education is largely a State matter when it comes to funding and a local matter when it comes to teaching and learning. But global education and global competition will go hand in hand. There must be some idea in our country of the world-class standards of excellence we need to really meet the challenges of the future.

As Secretary Riley reminded me, when we were Governors working together and the "Nation at Risk" report came out—that's what the name of the report was, and it came out in a Republican administration. It was "A Nation at Risk," not one place here and another place there and not somebody somewhere else. It was "A Nation at Risk." And Goals 2000 responds to that. It sets those standards reflecting the national education goals that were adopted by the Governors in 1989, working with President Bush and the Bush administration, plus a commitment to continuing development of our teachers, plus the very important parental involvement goal that the PTA got in this—[applause].

If it was a good idea last year with bipartisan support, it didn't just stop being a good idea because we had one election. We worked for 10 years on this in a bipartisan way. It didn't stop being a good idea because we had an election. That is not what the election was about. It was not about turning our backs on world-class excellence in education and a partnership to make our schools better and the support that you need to succeed in all of your communities. That was not what was going on.

The success we've had in the last 2 years is building on what has been done in the last 10 years. You know, after all, I think it's important to remember that there's been a lot of progress in our schools in the last 10 years.

To hear these folks talk about it, you'd think that it's all gotten worse and only because we had a Department of Education in Washington—ran the whole thing into the ditch. [Laughter] I don't know what they're doing in Idaho today, carrying the burden of the Department of Education around all day long in their schools. [Laughter] That's the kind of talk we've got.

The truth is that kids are staying in school longer, more of them are going to college, math and science performance is up, because we emphasized, we worked on those things. We did it together. Are there a lot of problems? You bet there are. But this country is the most remarkable experiment in diversity of all kinds in all of human history. And we are doing better because we are working together and setting goals and working as partners. And that's what we should continue to do.

Dick Riley in a way has been perfectly suited to be the Secretary of Education at this time. I can't imagine why anybody would want to abolish his job after watching him do it for a couple of years. I'd just like to point out something to the people who say on the other side that the answer to our problems in education is to abolish the Department of Education. I noticed one of the Republican leaders said the other day that they had actually—the Department of Education actually made things worse.

Well, here are the facts. There are fewer people working in the Department of Education today than were working for the Federal Government in education when it was part of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in the seventies. It's an inconvenient fact for the people who want to abolish it.

Here's another interesting fact. Secretary Riley has proposed to end in this present rescission package that we sent up, or in the coming budget, 41 programs and to consolidate 17 others, 58 of the 240 programs in the Department of Education—inconvenient facts for those that are saying that it's terrible and they're throwing money away. It happens to be true.

But we don't agree with what they're trying to do in the House, to cut \$1.7 billion from education, to eliminate all the funds for

the Safe and Drug-Free School program, all the funds at a time when, disturbingly, young people are beginning to use drugs casually again, forgetting that they're dangerous and illegal, when schools still need the funds to help them be literally more secure in difficult areas. They want to eliminate all the funds in that bill for teaching homeless children, all the funds for the parent resource centers, which you know are very important. We're dealing with a lot of parents, folks, who want to do a better job by their kids but need some help and some support from people like you who have been showing up in the PTA for years, some of you for decades. They need it. [Laughter] Well, your kid stays in school. [Laughter] Listen, I got to keep laughing. Otherwise, we'll be in tears thinking about this.

They want to eliminate much of the money for computers and new technologies. The amount they propose to cut from Goals 2000 is equal to all the funds now allocated for poor and rural communities and all the funds necessary to help 4,000 schools raise their academic standards. And they want, of course, to cut back on the school lunch program.

Now, how are we going to cut? Dick Riley found a way to cut 41 programs without doing this. This school lunch program is a mystery to me. Everybody wants to cut funds in the Agriculture Department because the number of farmers is smaller. You know what we did? We finally concluded a world trade agreement so that our competitors would have to cut agricultural subsidies, so we cut agriculture subsidies. And then we realized we had basically an outdated structure in the Agriculture Department. The best line in the '92 Presidential campaign was Ross Perot's line about the employee at the Department of Agriculture who had to go to the psychiatrist because he lost his farmer. [Laughter] Because the number of farmers had gone down.

So what did we do? We closed 1,200 agricultural offices. They want to cut the school lunch program. I think we know how to cut better than they do. I think that's the way to do it.

So let me say again, every effort we had in the last 2 years, from Head Start to ap-

prenticeships, to Goals 2000, to the reformation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, everything we did was done in a bipartisan way. And now, we see education becoming both a partisan and a divisive issue again. We cannot walk away from this. You need to be here. You are the reinforcements for America's future, and I want you to go up there today and say that, say this \$1.7 billion in a \$1.5 trillion budget is a drop in the bucket and it should not be eliminated to pay for \$188 billion in tax cuts. It should not.

You know, I want us to have the right framework here so that you can go back home and do your job. I've done everything I could and Secretary Riley's done everything he could to devise Goals 2000 so that we would really have a partnership. We'd say, here are some resources, here are the goals, here's what we know, you decide how to implement. We want more responsibility for principals and teachers and parents at the grassroots level. We want less control of education in Washington. We have done a lot in the legislation that we have passed to reduce the degree of Federal control and rule-making below that which previous administrations imposed. But we don't want to walk away from the kids and the future of this country.

I want to just mention one other thing. I want to thank Secretary Riley again for taking the lead in creating the National Family Involvement Partnership for Learning. It includes many members of the private sector, more than 100 organizations, including the PTA. He's been proposing seven basic steps for all parents to take. And I like them so much that I want to repeat them for every parent now here at the PTA meeting, because if these things are not done, then our efforts won't succeed. And if these things are done, then our efforts here become even more important to support the parents who are doing them: find more time to spend with your children; read with them; set high expectations for them; take away the remote control on school nights; check their homework; check their grades; set a good example; and talk directly to your children, especially to your teenagers, about the dangers of drugs and alcohol and the values you want them

to have. Thank you, Mr. Secretary. That's about as good as it gets. *[Applause]*

Let me say again in closing my remarks, I am doing my best to work in good faith with this new Congress. There are deep trends going on here which can make this a positive time if we stop posturing and put our people first. We do have to change the way Government works. We need dramatic reform in the Government, and we are working hard to get it.

But what is the purpose of all this? The purpose of all this is the same purpose that you have. To elevate the potential of the American people to make the most of their own lives, to keep the American dream alive, and to guarantee a future for their children. So go up there on Capitol Hill and remind everybody that we need to work together, tone down the rhetoric, and put the kids of this country and our future first.

Thank you, and God bless you.

[At this point, Kathryn Whitfill, National PTA president, thanked the President for his support and introduced a participant who voiced her concern that the Department of Education would be eliminated due to Federal budget cuts.]

The President. Well, for one thing, you have to ask yourself, why would they do this? First of all, there's a burden—why would you do it? And there are only two reasons to do it, to save money or because you think it's doing bad things or it's useless. And I noticed the other day that the majority leader of the Senate said that it was one of those departments that had done more harm than good.

Now, most of the time it's been in existence the Department of Education has been under control of Republican Secretaries of Education. Maybe they did do more harm than good—*[laughter]*—I hadn't really thought so until he said it. But maybe we need to reexamine that. But Secretary Riley has not done more harm than good. He's done more good than harm by a good, long ways.

And I think that it's just sort of fashionable now. I think the truth is that there have been big commitments made in terms of tax cuts, mostly for upper income people, and big commitments made in other areas. And so

they are looking for ways to save money. But this is not a good place. This is not the right thing to do. And we have worked very hard to have what I consider to be the appropriate level of partnership.

Now, on the block grant issue, generally, let me just say I'm not against all block grants. I strongly supported the community development block grant, for example, which the States get and which bigger cities get, and then they get to decide how they're going to use it to develop the economy and make reports on an annual basis to Federal Government. I think that's fine.

We supported in the crime bill last year more block granting, more flexibility to States and localities in prevention on crime and crime prevention programs because programs that work in one community may not work in another. They know what works best there. We've now given 26 States waivers from Federal rules to implement welfare reforms in their own States, because they know more about it.

But let's not kid ourselves, the school lunch program was proposed for block granting just to save the money, because it works the way it is. And we've made some significant improvements in the school lunch program. Last year, with your support, as you know, we got the nutritional standards up; we made some changes. The only reason it was proposed for block granting is because block grants are in; they're fashionable; they're a la mode today. And that's the way they could save some money.

If you add all this money up, it's just not very much money in this big Federal budget. And you could argue that we should be doing much more for education, but I think it's very hard to argue that we should be spending less.

[A participant asked how the PTA could become more involved in efforts to make schools in high-crime areas safer.]

The President. Well, I think the first thing I would say about that is that in the absence of security, not much learning is going to occur. You know that. We know that there are thousands of children who stay home from school every day because they are afraid of what might happen to them in school. We

see constantly examples of violence both in school buildings and then in the near vicinity of schools.

Now, what we tried to do with the safe and drug-free schools act, because there was violence in the schools and in the perimeter, is to provide some funds for things like security devices, metal detectors, things like that, but also more enforcement officers in the outside of school. Then I think you must have—the PTA and all the other committed groups in the country that care about the schools, but especially the PTA, has to work with every school district to make sure that there really is a functioning security policy.

You know, there are schools that are very safe environments in very high-crime areas in this country. So it's simply not true that there are no schools in high-crime areas that are safe. There are schools that are quite safe in very high-crime areas because of the security policies they have and because of the leadership and the discipline and the organization of resources that have been adopted and because they've gotten a lot of parental help often.

And so my recommendation is that you identify the schools that you think have done the best job in the most difficult circumstances, figure out what they did, and make sure every PTA chapter in the country has access to that knowledge, and then if we can get these funds and help out there, that you spend them in a way that will maximize the security in the schools in your area.

It's a huge deal, and there's no way—this is the kind of partnership we need. I mean, there's no way in the world the Federal Government can tell anybody how they should secure one, two, or three schools, because they all have different circumstances.

[A participant asked what State and local school officials could do to help protect the School-to-Work initiative from future budget cuts.]

The President. Well, the Federal School-to-Work initiative essentially tries to build on the work that's being done in States now. When I ran for President, I was fond of talking about the fact that we were the only advanced country in the world that had no real system for dealing with all the young people

who finished high school but didn't go on to 4-year colleges; and that, while most jobs in the 21st century would not require 4-year college degrees, most jobs would require at least 2 years of some sort of education and training after high school. And we already saw in the difference between the '80 and the '90 census what's happening to the earnings of people who don't have post-high school education and training.

Therefore, in terms of the long-term stability of a middle class lifestyle in America, that is, the idea that if you work harder and smarter, you might actually do a little better year in and year out, this School-to-Work system, the idea of putting in to some sort of apprenticeship development system in America, may be the most significant thing we can do to raise incomes. And so what our system does is to provide funds to States to help to build their own systems according to the best information we have and to build on the systems that States are working on.

And you're right. I did a lot of work on this at home because I became so alarmed, even as we got the college-going rate up, that, though we increased it quite a lot, there are all these people out there that were still just cut loose after high school. And we have to put an end to that. The best way to protect that program here is to—for every State to aggressively get with the Department of Education and begin to participate as quickly as possible.

That's the same thing with the Goals 2000. Secretary Riley's probably going to talk about this tomorrow, but I think we're on track for over 40 States to be involved in that pretty soon. And so the more States get involved, the more people get involved at the local level, the more it's Democrats and Republicans and independents, it's not a political deal, it's education, the more likely we are to continue to go forward with this.

[A participant asked how future cuts in entitlement programs could be prevented.]

The President. Well, I think, first of all, it's important for me to point out to all of you, if you talk about the entitlements, that an entitlement—let me say, an entitlement is a program in which there is no predetermined amount of money to be spent. That

is, if you need it under certain circumstances, the money will flow. A nonentitlement is a program where the Congress appropriates a certain amount of money every year and you spend that and it runs out and you don't spend anymore.

Entitlements basically fall into three categories. One is—the best example is agricultural entitlements, where the farm programs are set up like that because the farm economy will change from year to year, you know, based on not only weather conditions and crop conditions in the United States, but all around the world. And it's necessary to sort of even out the farming cycle.

The other programs, and by far the biggest entitlements today, are Medicare and Medicaid, the medical programs. And the main problem with the Federal budget today is not discretionary spending and education, is not defense spending—both discretionary spending and defense spending have been going down for the first time in 25 years—it's entitlements in health care, health care costs going up by more than the rate of inflation, and the accumulated interest payments on the debt run up between 1981 and 1993, when I took office. That's basically what the big problem is with the budget.

The other entitlements are entitlements basically for poor people, generally. And except for Medicaid, they, by and large, have not kept up with inflation, but they do provide a safety net. So if there is going to be a move away from those entitlements, the burden is on those who would move away to say, how are you going to care for these poor children?

Now, I like the Women, Infants and Children program; I like the school lunch program. I think these programs have worked pretty well for us over time. And we have an interest, all of us do, in not going back to the days when children were basically living in very brutal conditions. And I think there is a national interest in the welfare of the children.

I'm all for having the States have more flexibility about how to do these things, but I think there is a national interest in helping States to keep a floor under the lives of our children. Not every State is as wealthy as every other State. Not every State has the

same priorities. So, having a system that uniformly says we ought to have a quality of life for our poor children, that we believe that all of our children ought to have a chance to get to the starting line is pretty important.

What does the first education goal say?

Audience members. Ready to learn.

The President. Yes. Every kid ought to show up ready to learn, right? Not just intellectually but physically able to learn. My argument is, if I were making your strategy, I would say that we represent the PTA, and our schools can't succeed if, by the time our kids show up for school, their deprivations have already been so great that they will never overcome them, and that the rest of us will pay a whole lot more in tax money and social misery later on down the road if we back away from our obligation to get these kids to school ready to learn.

[Ms. Whitfill thanked the President for participating and presented him with a paper-weight.]

The President. Thank you very much. Thank you. Bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:15 a.m. at the Washington Renaissance Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Essie Middleton, president of the Arkansas PTA and member of the National PTA Board of Directors.

Statement on the Nomination of Lt. Gen. Charles C. Krulak To Be Commandant of the Marine Corps *March 14, 1995*

I am pleased to nominate Lt. Gen. Charles C. Krulak, U.S. Marine Corps, for appointment to the grade of general and as Commandant of the Marine Corps, succeeding Gen. Carl E. Mundy, Jr., who is retiring.

I have asked the Secretary of the Navy to announce my decision today in ceremonies at Iwo Jima commemorating the 50th anniversary of the battle.

General Krulak currently serves as Commander, U.S. Marine Corps Forces Pacific and Commanding General, Fleet Marine Force Pacific. In this capacity, he is responsible for Marine Corps units and activities throughout the Pacific theater. During his

distinguished career, General Krulak served two command tours in Vietnam, oversaw the Marine Corps logistic efforts during Desert Storm, and was responsible for significant and innovative changes in military doctrine and organization. He brings to the job of Commandant a dynamic vision of the Marine Corps' future, a wealth of experience, and a highly effective leadership and managerial style.

General Krulak assumes the post of Commandant of the Marine Corps at an important time in the U.S. Marine Corps' history. I will depend on him to continue General Mundy's superb efforts in ensuring that the Marine Corps remains fully ready and able in carrying out its important responsibilities under our national security strategy.

Statement on Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Henry Cisneros *March 14, 1995*

Henry Cisneros' service as Secretary of Housing and Urban Development has been outstanding, and I know him to be a man of integrity and character. The Attorney General has determined that the facts warrant the appointment of an independent counsel to inquire into a question she believes is a "close and difficult factual and legal issue."

Secretary Cisneros is a good man and an effective public servant. He says he regrets any mistakes he has made. So do I. But that does not outweigh the excellent work he has been doing and will do as Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. I look forward to his continued valuable service.

Proclamation 6777—National Day of Prayer, 1995 *March 14, 1995*

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Our Nation was built on the steadfast foundation of the prayers of our ancestors. In times of blessing and crisis, stability and change, thanksgiving and repentance, ap-

peals for Divine direction have helped the citizens of the United States to remain faithful to our long-standing commitment to life, liberty, and justice for all.

This reliance on spiritual assistance has especially characterized times of national transition and uncertainty. As our country was ravaged by the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln remarked, "I have been driven many times upon my knees by the overwhelming conviction that I had nowhere else to go." And with him, millions of slaves cried out to the Almighty for an end to their suffering.

Abolitionist Frederick Douglass said this about the spiritual songs sung on the plantations: "Every tone was a testimony against slavery, and a prayer to God for deliverance from chains." Since that time, we have witnessed tremendous improvements in relations between people of all races and backgrounds. Indeed, long ago, through the work of prayer and common effort, and with the inspiration of the Creator, we began to turn the tide in this Nation from divisiveness and recrimination toward reconciliation and healing.

Let us not forget those painful lessons of our past, but continue to seek the guidance of God in all the affairs of our Nation. We must not become complacent, but rather press onward for the protection of the vulnerable and the downtrodden. In the words of President Lincoln, "it behooves us then to humble ourselves before the offended Power, to confess our national sins and pray for clemency and forgiveness" for any injustice we perceive in our midst. May we, the people of this country, set a steady course, dedicated to respect for one another and for individual freedom.

The Congress, by Public Law 100-307, has called on our citizens to reaffirm annually our dependence on Almighty God by recognizing a "National Day of Prayer."

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim May 4, 1995, as a National Day of Prayer. I call upon every citizen of this great Nation to gather together on that day to pray, each in his or her own manner, for God's continued guidance and blessing.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this fourteenth day of March, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-five, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and nineteenth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 2:02 p.m., March 15, 1995]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on March 17.

Remarks at the Radio and Television Correspondents Association Dinner

March 14, 1995

Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Bill. I can't think of anything better for a politician than to be introduced by a guy named "Headline." [Laughter]

Hillary and I are delighted to be here. I am told that this is by far the largest group of radio and television correspondents ever assembled this far from a Los Angeles courtroom. [Laughter] You know, the press is always asking me if I'm watching the O.J. trial, and Mike McCurry always has to say, oh, he's so busy with affairs of—of course, I watch it. [Laughter] And the other day I was watching it, and the camera zoomed in to Judge Ito's computer monitor. You've seen that, haven't you? There was an E-mail message on it from Wolf Blitzer begging for a recess. [Laughter]

You know, every year when I come here, even though I've only been here a couple of years, I recognize more and more faces. And now I'm getting so good at it I can tell when people are missing. [Laughter] This year, thanks to Mr. Armey and others, PBS couldn't afford a ticket for both MacNeil and Lehrer. [Laughter] I know that because Louis Rukeyser told me that when he checked my coat when I came in. [Laughter]

I'm trying to figure out what's going on here. I guess the rest of you are, too. I have puzzled over this Republican assault on affirmative action. You know, the Republicans started affirmative action under Mr. Nixon. I think the reason that they don't like it anymore is because the Democrats are now a

minority. [Laughter] I have decided to adopt their position on another important issue: term limits. I'll settle for two. [Laughter]

You know, this campaign is amazing. It's gotten so heated up that when I called L.L. Bean last week they told me they're back-ordered on red flannel shirts for several months. Because I'm President, they promised to send me mine by June. [Laughter]

Look, in spite of this campaign, I want to tell you that I am going to keep doing the job the American people elected me to do. I'm going to let the rest just take care of itself. I'm still working on Saturdays. I mean, I was working on Saturday a couple of weeks ago, trying to do the things that a President really doesn't have time for during the week. I was reinventing my filing system according to Gore, adding up my own frequent flier miles on Air Force One. I even did a little spackling in the Roosevelt Room. [Laughter] And I noticed—I looked outside and there was the Vice President mulching the environment in the Rose Garden. [Laughter] So I invited him in, and we—there we were, all alone on a Saturday, a beautiful Saturday, and we got into this deep discussion about the new ideas we needed for reinventing Government. I said, "You know, we've got to have exciting ideas, breakthrough ideas, third-wave ideas." And so, we began to think. Right off the bat in this drive to downsize Government, we discovered that there was a useless extra "C" in the FCC, and we got rid of it right away. [Laughter]

Then we asked ourselves, in our lust for consolidation, "Do we really need North and South Dakota?" [Laughter] But when we thought of how frugal and inexpensive they were, and when we remembered the votes on the balanced budget amendment, we said, "Yes, we do." [Laughter] Furthermore, for economy's sake, we intend to propose a Central Dakota for this Congress. [Laughter] The Vice President, ever the humble public servant, suggested that this year we could save money by doing away with the White House Christmas tree, and we could just hang the ornaments on him. Now, he approved that joke, I want you to know. [Laughter]

Then Leon Panetta came in, and we had, finally, at last, three people in the same room in the White House who were over 45.

[Laughter] And we decided that we could consolidate our staff further by replacing fifteen 30-year-olds with five 90-year-olds. [Laughter] Then the rest of the staff came in. They all trooped in, and we were talking about new ideas, these exciting breakthrough ideas. We discussed an opportunity for entrepreneurship in dealing with the deficit, which I know the Republicans will agree with. Next week I intend to propose that we put the President and the Congress on commissions. Then we'll turn a profit in no time. All your programs will be gone, but we'll do well. [Laughter]

This is a serious proposal. Instead of getting rid of all these domestic observances that we have, all these domestic programs, why don't we do what all the athletic events are doing, you know, like the Mobil Cotton Bowl? Let's get corporate sponsorships for Government. Like, we could make February 12 Lincoln-Mercury's birthday. [Laughter]

And you all tell me all the time I need to do better marketing. So we have a new idea. We're going to put Ed McMahon's picture on the IRS refund checks. Just imagine, when you get your envelope from the Treasury Department, up in the corner it says, "You may already be a winner." [Laughter]

Two other ideas we had—somebody in one of these meetings—you know, even the Democrats go too far sometimes on downsizing Government. One of them said we ought to turn the Pentagon into a triangle. And I said, no, I am going to hold the line with a veto threat for a rhombus. [Laughter] Then it was suggested that the greatest consolidation we could do is to consolidate the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Joint Chiefs of Staff into the Joint Chiefs. [Laughter] You know, I was afraid that was politically incorrect, but it got by. It got by. [Laughter]

Now, this is the most important thing I'm going to say tonight. I came here to offer a way to make peace with our Republican friends on this heated school lunch issue. Al Gore and I have discovered a reinventing Government way, Mr. Armey, to get around this terrible rhetoric we've been flinging at you on school lunches. We have a way to save money through streamlining that does not require us to deprive our children of

food. Instead of cutting food, we're going to cut the cutlery. And here's how: with a spork. [Laughter] Now, you know, I don't know how many of you know this, I've been eating off these things for years. I never knew they were called sporks. But that's what they are. This is the symbol of my administration. This is a cross between a spoon and fork, no more false choice between the left utensil and the right utensil. This is not an ideological choice. This is a choice in the middle and a choice for the future. This is a big, new idea, the spork. [Laughter]

Now, when we get by that, I'm going to reach a breakthrough agreement with Senator Dole to cut down on the commuting costs of Congress by moving the Senate sessions to New Hampshire. [Laughter] I'm hoping even to get Senator Gramm's vote for that. [Laughter]

Also, we decided to do something for that group of constituents that's supposed to be so alienated from the Democratic Party. We want to combine the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms with both the Bureau of Fisheries and the Interstate Trucking Commission. We're going to call it the Department of Guys. [Laughter] And if you don't like it, there ain't a place for you in the Democratic Party anymore. [Laughter]

Finally, I have decided to support the most controversial Republican idea in the legal reform area: loser pays. But only if we tie it to campaign finance reform and make it retroactive to 1992. [Laughter]

Now, that was what Al Gore and I did on just another Saturday afternoon at the White House. So even though all the action's with the Republicans on the Hill, I just wanted you to know you're still getting your money's worth out of us. [Laughter] It shows you the kind of great thinking you get out of a bunch of highly motivated people who don't get enough sleep at night. [Laughter]

Well, I could go on like this forever, but you know that, don't you? [Laughter] Let me say, for 51 years, all of you have gotten together and invited others to join you in celebrating the best of the electronic media. And while the times change and the rules change and the practices change, I really believe that most of us in this room, like the people who came here 51 years ago, want what's best for

our country and do what we do in the hope that we're doing it well enough to advance the interests of the United States and to keep the American dream alive.

This is an unusual and difficult time for all of us because of all the challenges out there in the country today, but it's a very, very exciting time, not only to be covering events in Washington but to be a part of it. I thank you for the work you do, and I thank you for having us here tonight.

I do want to say that I'm a little apprehensive; the next speaker, Bill Maher, has a TV show named "Politically Incorrect." Out of respect for him, I've tried not to be politically incorrect tonight. Out of respect for me, I hope he won't try to be Presidential tonight. [Laughter]

Thank you all, and good night.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:42 p.m. at the Washington Hilton. In his remarks he referred to Bill Headline, chair, Radio and Television Correspondents Association; CNN News reporter Wolf Blitzer; Congressman Richard Armey; Robert MacNeil and James Lehrer, co-anchors of the MacNeil/Lehrer Newshour; economic commentator Louis Rukeyser; and TV host Ed McMahon.

Remarks at an Arrival Ceremony for King Hassan II of Morocco

March 15, 1995

Your Majesty, Your Royal Highnesses, members of the Moroccan delegation, distinguished guests: On behalf of the United States, it is my honor to welcome back to Washington a good friend of America and one of the Islamic world's most respected leaders, King Hassan II.

Your Majesty, the ties that link our two nations go back to the dawn of our independence. Before the cornerstone of this White House was laid, President George Washington and your ancestor, Sultan Mohammad III, signed a treaty of peace and friendship.

In the decades since, our two nations have sought to live up to that treaty's ideals by building on our friendship and working for peace and prosperity in your region and throughout the world. Now, much of what we have labored for and dreamed of is closer

than ever to becoming reality, thanks in good measure to your wisdom and to your vision.

Your Majesty, you have worked tirelessly to secure a lasting and comprehensive peace in the Middle East, from helping to arrange President Sadat's historic journey to Jerusalem to building trust through quiet diplomacy, from establishing ties with Israel to hosting the Casablanca Economic Summit. Now, we must accelerate the momentum for peace in the Middle East, the momentum which you have done so much to nurture and sustain.

As Morocco and the United States work for peace, we are also forging stronger bonds of commerce between our peoples. Morocco has embraced free markets, and today your economy stands poised to reap the benefits of this wise decision. Your Majesty, I look forward to discussing new opportunities for trade and investment which will support good jobs and create wealth in both our nations.

Your Majesty, under your leadership, Morocco has served as a force for tolerance and progress rooted in Islamic values. At a time when cooperation and moderation are taking hold in more countries than ever before but when violence and extremism still threaten all that we are working for, your example and your commitment to peace are more important than ever before.

Your Majesty, the United States is glad to have you as a friend, honored to have you as a partner as we work to shape the world for the better. Welcome to the White House. Welcome to America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:46 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House.

The President's News Conference With King Hassan II

March 15, 1995

The President. Good afternoon. His Majesty King Hassan and I have just concluded a very productive and wide-ranging meeting. We apologize for talking a little longer than the scheduled time, but we had much to discuss. Let me begin by thanking him for his

visit, and continuing the tradition that he first began with President Kennedy of providing wise counsel to American Presidents.

Of course, we talked about how we can best support and accelerate the momentum for peace in the Middle East. His Majesty's visit comes at a time of renewed hope. As a result of Secretary Christopher's intensive discussions in the region, we now have an agreement to resume direct talks between Israel and Syria. This is a very encouraging development. Combined with the new energy we see in the Israel-Palestinian discussions and continued progress in implementing the Jordan-Israel peace treaty, I believe there is now a real opportunity to secure a durable resolution to the Arab-Israeli conflict.

The promise of peace owes much to King Hassan's vision and courage. He helped to arrange President Sadat's historic trip to Jerusalem. He undertook a direct dialog with Israel at a time when doing so was difficult. His quiet diplomacy facilitated talks between other Arab leaders and Israel. And Morocco continues to lead the effort to build a new Middle East.

His Majesty and I agreed that one key to peace is bringing tangible economic benefits to the people of the Middle East, a change in the quality of their daily lives so that they can develop a real stake in peaceful cooperation. That's why the process begun under King Hassan's leadership at the Casablanca summit last October is so important in order to expand economic integration and encourage private sector growth and investment.

His Majesty and I reviewed the next step in this process, including the Amman business summit this fall. We also discussed taking down barriers to trade and investment, such as the Arab League boycott of Israel that had denied the Middle East its full place as a dynamic participant in the global economy.

We discussed our shared interest in fighting the spread of weapons of mass destruction, which pose a threat to the entire Middle East and, indeed, to the world. I emphasized the importance the United States attaches to securing the indefinite extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty as a vital part of this effort.

We are also working to build closer economic ties. Today we will sign a trade and investment framework agreement to expand bilateral commerce and investment and to provide a framework for further trade liberalization. And Morocco announced plans to establish a counterpart in the United States to the U.S.-Morocco Joint Committee on Trade and Investment.

Later this afternoon, His Majesty will preside over a protocol signing with the Overseas Private Investment Corporation. OPIC will guarantee \$200 million in U.S. Government support for a \$1.5 billion powerplant being built by an American company near Casablanca. Morocco's decision to welcome foreign participation in privatizing its state-owned power sector made this project possible. Together with similar ventures in the future, it promises to generate jobs and exports for the United States and to provide Morocco with the electricity it needs to power its own industrial growth.

Finally, I'd like to express my own gratitude to the King for his enlightened leadership of the Organization of the Islamic Conference. I share his conviction that Islam can be a powerful force for tolerance and moderation in the world and that its traditional values—devotion to family and to society, to faith and good works—are in harmony with the best of Western ideals.

As I said in my speeches to the Parliaments of Jordan and Israel, the United States has great respect for Islam and wishes to work with its followers throughout the world to secure peace and a better future for all our children.

Throughout the course of our long friendship, which goes back to the very beginning of this country, Morocco and the United States have worked together to shape the world we live in for the better. King Hassan and I are committed to continuing that great partnership for progress well into the future. And I thank him for the contributions he has made to that today.

Your Majesty.

King Hassan. To begin with, I'd like to reiterate my thanks to Mr. President for the warm welcome with which we have been surrounded ever since we have tread the soil of this country.

We have spoken about many issues, Mr. President and myself. Now, we did not have the opportunity of knowing each other personally before, but we have come to know each other through the messages that we have exchanged in the past and also by means of the various positions that were taken by Mr. President concerning the peace in the Middle East. I think that Mr. Clinton should be proud of his balance sheet after 2 years in the White House.

We have also talked about bilateral issues, and thanks to God, we have come to realize how much harmony exists between the positions of our two countries. However, in the modern world in which we live today, there can be no schizophrenia in any healthy relationship. There is absolutely no justification for us to have such excellent political relations on the one hand and then on the other hand to have economic relations that are not up to the same level.

Up to now, we have been a one-legged man in our mutual action. And I hope that in the future we will be able to walk on two feet, that is, hand in hand, towards the prosperity and the success we are hoping for both countries.

Obviously, the United States of America has its own vision of matters because it deals with international issues. And therefore, the analysis of matters have to be to that proportion.

Morocco, though modest the way it is, has its own vision of things. Thanks to God, during our talks, we had absolutely no differences concerning our principles, ideals, and the aims that are to be attained. But considering that Mr. President and myself are perfectionists, we have to devise the most appropriate strategy in order for us to reach the aims that both countries have in mind.

Mr. President, once again I want to thank you for your warm welcome, but I would like also to thank you for the open heart with which I have been received here in the White House.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, you spoke this morning of the need to accelerate the peace process. What can the United States do to break the

impasse when Syria and Israel resume negotiations next week?

The President. Well, of course we're doing what we can with the Secretary's trip to the Middle East, and with the work that Mr. Ross and others are doing. What we have sought to do, always, is to facilitate the conditions within which both parties will feel secure in making peace. That has always been our role. We cannot make a peace for the parties, and we're doing what we can once again, to make our best case to both sides about what things will make them secure in making the decision.

As you know, when they discuss matters of this kind, it's best to let them deal with the details and make the decisions. So the less I say about the specifics, the greater the opportunity they have to make the peace.

Is there a question from Morocco?

North Africa

Q. Mr. President, you have spoken during the last visit you had made that you were concerned with stability—in Paris—that you were concerned with stability in North Africa. You have also spoken about the fact that Morocco is a point of stability and security in the region. Now, in your discussions with His Majesty, did you come to devise some kind of strategy in order to strengthen and sustain this idea of the security in the North African region?

The President. His Majesty and I spoke at great length about North Africa, and I asked him for his evaluation and for his advice with regard to a number of countries. And I think it's fair to say that he believes the United States is pursuing the right policy.

One of the things I think we have to do is to try to strengthen economically the forces of progress and tolerance, which is why I'm very pleased about the agreements that we have announced with Morocco today. We will continue to push to support elements of progress and tolerance in other nations as well.

Your Majesty, would you like to say anything about that question?

Middle East Development Bank

Q. The question is addressed to both you and His Majesty. What about the latest in

the establishment of the Middle East development bank? The regional powers are anxious for it in the Middle East, but some European leaders are opposed to it. What is happening with it, and if so, what's the timetable on it?

The President. I don't know that I can give you a timetable. I can tell you that we are committed to it, as you know, and we are working with our allies in Europe. We're doing our best to set it up, and we'll do it as quickly as possible. I still think it's a good idea.

King Hassan and U.S. Presidents

Q. Your Majesty, you had the opportunity to meet seven Presidents of the United States. How did you find the President Bill Clinton different of the other? Thank you.

King Hassan. First, let me say no two men are alike. As a wise man once said, style is what defines the man. All the different Presidents that I've had the honor to meet here contribute together to the richness and the variety in the United States. Each time it has been a new style, a new inspiration, a new team.

The President. If His Majesty had not been a direct descendant of the Prophet, he might have become Morocco's greatest diplomat. [Laughter]

Egypt

Q. Thank you, Mr. President, Your Majesty, I'd like to ask you, sir, what you make of the increasing political difficulties that President Mubarak is said to be facing in Egypt, and whether this subject arose between the two of you today? And also, Mr. President, I'd like to have your views on that as well.

King Hassan. Let me state, first of all, that this world in which we live cannot be without political crisis. Each country, on whatever continent and whatever the social economic level and governance it has, confronts difficulties in economic, social, or employment areas. But it was not on our agenda to carry out a checkup on Egypt, so we did not take the time to devote to that particular issue.

The President. The only thing I would add is I thought His Majesty made a very

important point when we discussed this briefly, which was that you cannot see the Egyptian difficulties solely in political terms, and that they have to be seen in the context of the challenge that that nation—and I might add, many others are having around the world—of sustainable development, of balancing a rapidly growing population with all the pressures and problems that creates with the need to provide for them food and shelter and education and a stable set of opportunities. And I appreciated that insight very much.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Your Majesty, we would like to know what you are doing on the level of the peace process in the Middle East and what is your position about the Arab boycott of Israel? Are there any disagreements between Morocco and the United States regarding this issue?

King Hassan. Yes, indeed, we did discuss the issue of boycott—or that is, the boycott of the Arab States towards Israel. As I've said previously, I believe that man cannot walk on one leg. We are not looking into the peace process without looking into the economic peace process also. The boycott of which you have spoken is not a Moroccan-Israeli issue. It is a boycott on the part of all of the members of the Arab League and independently of whatever the view of any of the members of the Arab League is. Concerning this issue, I would say that there has to be a compromise among the members of the Arab League if the boycott is to be lifted.

As Mr. President has said previously, there are signs of good will that have been reported from Secretary Christopher's trip to Syria. And there is no doubt that the progress that is scored in the peace negotiations between Israel and Syria will certainly bring about a collective decision on the part of all of the members of the Arab League concerning the lifting of the boycott.

The President. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President's 89th news conference began at 1:17 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Dennis B. Ross, Special Middle East Coordinator. King Hassan spoke in Arabic and French, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter.

Executive Order 12957—Prohibiting Certain Transactions With Respect to the Development of Iranian Petroleum Resources

March 15, 1995

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*), the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), and section 301 of title 3, United States Code,

I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, find that the actions and policies of the Government of Iran constitute an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States, and hereby declare a national emergency to deal with that threat.

I hereby order:

Section 1. The following are prohibited, except to the extent provided in regulations, orders, directives, or licenses that may be issued pursuant to this order, and notwithstanding any contract entered into or any license or permit granted prior to the effective date of this order: (a) the entry into or performance by a United States person, or the approval by a United States person of the entry into or performance by an entity owned or controlled by a United States person, of (i) a contract that includes overall supervision and management responsibility for the development of petroleum resources located in Iran, or (ii) a guaranty of another person's performance under such a contract;

(b) the entry into or performance by a United States person, or the approval by a United States person of the entry into or performance by an entity owned or controlled by a United States person, of (i) a contract for the financing of the development of petroleum resources located in Iran, or (ii) a guaranty of another person's performance under such a contract; and

(c) any transaction by any United States person or within the United States that evades or avoids, or has the purpose of evading or avoiding, or attempts to violate, any of the prohibitions set forth in this order.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this order: (a) The term “person” means an individual or entity;

(b) The term “entity” means a partnership, association, trust, joint venture, corporation, or other organization;

(c) The term “United States person” means any United States citizen, permanent resident alien, entity organized under the laws of the United States (including foreign branches), or any person in the United States; and

(d) The term “Iran” means the land territory claimed by Iran and any other area over which Iran claims sovereignty, sovereign rights or jurisdiction, including the territorial sea, exclusive economic zone, and continental shelf claimed by Iran.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, is hereby authorized to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, and to employ all powers granted to me by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this order. The Secretary of the Treasury may redelegate any of these functions to other officers and agencies of the United States Government. All agencies of the United States Government are hereby directed to take all appropriate measures within their authority to carry out the provisions of this order.

Sec. 4. Nothing contained in this order shall create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable by any party against the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities, its officers or employees, or any other person.

Sec. 5. (a) This order is effective at 12:01 a.m., eastern standard time, on March 16, 1995.

(b) This order shall be transmitted to the Congress and published in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
March 15, 1995.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 4:50 p.m., March 15, 1995]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the *Federal Register* on March 17.

Message to the Congress on the Prohibition on Development of Iranian Petroleum Resources
March 15, 1995

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 204(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1703(b)) and section 301 of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1631), I hereby report that I have exercised my statutory authority to declare a national emergency to respond to the actions and policies of the Government of Iran and to issue an Executive order prohibiting United States persons from entering into contracts for the financing of or the overall management or supervision of the development of petroleum resources located in Iran or over which Iran claims jurisdiction.

The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to issue regulations in exercise of my authorities under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act to implement these prohibitions. All Federal agencies are also directed to take actions within their authority to carry out the provisions of the Executive order.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive order that I have issued. The order is effective at 12:01 a.m., eastern standard time, on March 16, 1995.

I have authorized these measures in response to the actions and policies of Iran including support for international terrorism, efforts to undermine the Middle East Peace Process, and the acquisition of weapons of mass destructions and the means to deliver them. We have worked energetically to press the Government of Iran to cease this unacceptable behavior. To that end we have worked closely with Allied governments to prevent Iran's access to goods that would enhance its military capabilities and allow it to further threaten the security of the region. We have also worked to limit Iran's financial resources by opposing subsidized lending.

Iran has reacted to the limitations on its financial resources by negotiating for Western firms to provide financing and know-how

for management of the development of petroleum resources. Such development would provide new funds that the Iranian Government could use to continue its current policies. It continues to be the policy of the U.S. Government to seek to limit those resources and these prohibitions will prevent United States persons from acting in a manner that undermines that effort.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
March 15, 1995.

Remarks at a State Dinner Honoring King Hassan II

March 15, 1995

Ladies and gentlemen, Your Majesty, Your Royal Highnesses, members of the Moroccan delegation, distinguished guests: Hillary and I are delighted to welcome you to America's home. I have been grateful for this opportunity to get to know Your Majesty and to appreciate the wise counsel you have given to every American President since John Kennedy.

In fact, your relationship with our country's leaders, I have learned, goes back even further than that. In January of 1943, at the height of World War II, you were present when your father Mohammed V, hosted the Casablanca summit between President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill. History does not record what advice you gave President Roosevelt and the Prime Minister, but I did note that, thereafter, the war turned decisively to the allies' advantage. [*Laughter*] So, clearly, you gave good advice.

I also noted that when President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill were in Casablanca, Mr. Roosevelt thought he had to come home and go to work, and Prime Minister Churchill made him stay in Morocco for 3 more days to see the beautiful sights. My staff never lets me do that. [*Laughter*] So we have not made progress in every respect since the 1940's.

Your Majesty, you have written that in the joyous moment following the declaration of Morocco's independence, your father pulled you aside and said, "We have passed through a difficult trial. But the road ahead will be

long and hard. We do not have the right to disappoint the faithful and courageous people who have placed their trust in us." For the past 34 years, you have lived by your father's admonition. And by pursuing progress for the Moroccan people and peace for all the peoples of your region, you have truly fulfilled his legacy.

The American people especially admire your steadfast devotion to securing a comprehensive peace among all the peoples of the Middle East. In a region where passion and hatred have so often overwhelmed cooler heads and clearer minds, yours has always been a voice of reason and tolerance. Quoting from the Koran, you have said, "If two groups of believers fight each other, endeavor to reconcile them." You have been tireless in your pursuit of reconciliation. You have helped the countries of the Middle East turn on the past and start a new chapter of peaceful coexistence.

Your Majesty, you have spoken of your beloved Morocco as a bridge between East and West, between Islam and the Judeo-Christian faiths, between respect for tradition and openness to the future. Under your leadership, that bridge which runs from the tip of Europe to the sands of the Sahara and joins the Atlantic to the Mediterranean, that bridge has risen high as a beacon of hope.

And for all those reasons, ladies and gentlemen, honored guests, please join me in raising a glass to His Majesty, King Hassan II, to the Prince and the Princess who are here, and to the people of Morocco, who have done so much to build the bridges of understanding and peace.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:45 p.m. in the State Dining Room at the White House.

Remarks on Regulatory Reform in Arlington, Virginia

March 16, 1995

The President. Thank you, Stu, and, ladies and gentlemen, thank you. Let me first of all say how delighted I am to be in this wonderful place. Among other things, they do their printing here with soy ink, and that's really why we're here, because I come from Arkansas, and my—[*laughter*—my farmer

friends grow a lot of soybeans, and we're always looking for new markets, and we're just trying to support responsible people who are using great ink.

This is a wonderful story today, and I thank all of these people for hosting us, Stu and all of his partners behind us, to make a point that, to me, is very, very important. You heard the Vice President say that last month I called together the heads of the Federal regulatory agencies and told them to begin a root and branch examination of how we regulate the American people in all the various ways that we do.

I wanted to make this the next big part of the reinventing Government process that the Vice President has overseen so well for the last 2 years. And today, we want to announce the fruits of that process. But it's important to remember what the purpose is. Most Americans are honest people. The free enterprise system brings us great benefits. But we know we have certain things in common that we have to pursue through the Government that we all are responsible for.

The question is: How can we do it best? Today, we're announcing basically two sets of changes: First of all, some Government-wide regulatory reforms that will cut back on paperwork and trust honest business people as partners, not adversaries and, second, significant reforms in the way we protect the environment and the way we assure safe and high quality drugs and medical devices.

The philosophy that guided these changes is pretty simple: Protect people, not bureaucracy; promote results, not rules; get action, not rhetoric; wherever possible, try to embrace common sense; it will confound your enemies and elate your friends. [*Laughter*]

Since I became President, I have worked hard on this. You know, I spent 12 years as a Governor of a State where I got to deal with the regulatory apparatus of the Federal Government as it related to both State Government and to every friend I had in every walk of life in my State. And I found that in the environmental area, for example, we often had both the environmentalists and the people who were in business both frustrated by some things that were going on. And I could give you lots of other examples, and

all of you can, as well, from your own personal experience.

Our goal is to get rid of yesterday's Government so that we're capable of meeting the problems of today and the challenges of tomorrow. We want a Government that offers opportunity, demands responsibility, and shrinks bureaucracy, one that embodies the New Covenant I've been talking about, more opportunity and more responsibility with a less bureaucratic Government. I think Government can be as innovative as the best of our private sector businesses. I think Government can discard volume after volume of rules and, instead, set clear goals and challenge people to come up with their own ways to meet them. That kind of Government will be very different from the old one-size-fits-all bureaucracy. But it also would be different from the new proposals for one-size-fits-all deregulation and cutbacks.

I want to see a different approach. I want a Government that is limited but effective, that is lean but not mean, that does what it should do better and simply stops doing things that it shouldn't be doing in the first place, that protects consumers and workers, the environment, without burdening business, choking innovation, or wasting the money of the American taxpayers.

We do need to reduce paperwork and unnecessary regulation. I don't think we want to freeze efforts to protect our children from unsafe toys or unsafe food. We do need to carefully analyze the risks, the costs, the benefits of everything we do, but I don't think it's a better approach to pile on dozens of new procedural requirements. That will only run up legal bills and weaken the public trust. Paralysis by process is not common sense.

So as I said before, reform, yes, and let's do it with a bipartisan flare, but let's don't roll back our commitment to the things that make life worth living here. We all want water we can drink and air we can breathe, food we can eat, and a place we can work in and feel safe and secure. But we know that the way we have sought these goals through Government often, often has frustrated the very goals we seek. The way our regulatory system has grown into a dense jungle of rules and regulations, precise lists of

do this and don't do that, can trip up even the most well-intentioned business person.

Can you imagine a fellow like this running a shop like this on the cutting edge of the environment, is afraid to call the Federal Government for advice? There is no better example of what has been wrong. Here's a guy who's tried to do right, wants to do more right, and is afraid that if he does it, he'll be punished for doing it. It really is true that often in the Government no good deed goes unpunished. *[Laughter]* So it's time to stop doing things that drive people up the wall.

A few weeks ago, my good friend the Governor of Florida, who is also on this journey with us and has talked to me for more than—oh, I don't know—10 years we've been working on these issues, long before I ever thought of running for President, gave me this remarkable book that is now sweeping the country, "The Death of Common Sense." It makes an interesting point, the book does. It says that in our entirely understandable and necessary desire to protect the public, we have put in place a system that very often requires those who are carrying it out to defy common sense, unduly burden private taxpayers, and undermine the very objectives we are seeking to achieve.

Now, the author of that book, Philip Howard, has made a major contribution to the American debate on this. He's here with us today. He has done some work with the Vice President's National Performance Review, and I'd like to ask him to stand and be recognized. And thank you, sir, for doing this. *[Applause]*

Over the last 2 years, we've tried to get this Government of ours into some kind of shape. We have lowered the deficit by \$600 billion, and we've reduced the size of the Federal bureaucracy by over 100,000. We're on the way to reducing the Federal work force by more than a quarter of a million. It'll be the smallest it's been since President Kennedy was here when our budgets are finally implemented.

Now, we've tried to do more than that. We've tried to do more than just cut. We've tried to change the way the Government works. We've tried to spend more money, for example, on education and training and research and technology, the things that we

believe will raise incomes, offer more people opportunity, and protect the environment while we grow the economy. I don't think we should apologize for that. We should exercise judgment and common sense about what we cut and what we spend money on.

We also are trying to change the regulatory environment. I was proud to sign the first bill this new Congress passed, which applies to Congress most of the laws they impose on the private sector. I think that will have a very salutary impact on the deliberations of Congress.

We are about to get a bill out of the Congress which will restrict the ability of Congress to impose mandates on State and local governments that are unfunded; I think that is a good idea. And maybe most important of all, we're working hard, as the Vice President has said, to eliminate rules that are obsolete, to simplify rules that are too complicated, to cut paperwork wherever we can, in short, just to change the way Government works.

Most of the people I grew up with, who all write me with their great ideas now that I've become President, are just out there living in this country, making a living, raising their families, obeying the law, and doing the best they can. I believe their biggest objection to Government is not the size of it but the way it regulates, the way it operates in their own lives.

And I have done my best, relying on the extraordinary leadership of the Vice President and the National Performance Review staff and all the people who have been introduced here, particularly from the SBA and the EPA and the FDA and the Office of Management and Budget, to try to change this.

Let me just give you some examples. We want economic development. We've got the most active Commerce Department in American history. But the Commerce Department is also cutting the rules for businesses in half. That will also develop the economy. We want nutritious food, and the USDA has raised food safety standards, but they're also making it easier to import safe fruits and vegetables. We ought to repeal silly rules. The Department of the Interior just

eliminated feather import quotas for exotic birds and a lot of other things as well.

So what are we going to do now? Today we're announcing the first big steps of what I assure you is just the beginning of a process that we intend to continue for as long as we have the public trust. First, we want to do something that recognizes that most of the businesses in this country are small, most of them want to do the right thing, and most of the new jobs are being created by them. We want to get our enforcers out of the business of mindlessly writing traffic tickets and into the business of achieving results. We're going to let these regulators apply common sense.

Two of the three problems Mr. Howard talks about in his book are addressed here today. One is that in our attempt to try to tell people how we think the Government should regulate, we have tried to imagine all conceivable permutations of things that could occur and then write rules to cover them. The other is that we've been far more obsessed—the Government has in the past—with process than results. That's the general problem I might add, of Washington, DC, not confined entirely to the Government. [Laughter]

Today, we are ordering a Government-wide policy. Enforcers will be given the authority to waive up to 100 percent of punitive fines for small businesses so that a business person who acts in good faith can put his energy into fixing the problem, not fighting with a regulator. In other words, if they want to spend the fine money fixing the problem, better they should keep it and fix the problem than give it to the Government.

Similarly, regulators will be given the discretion to waive fines for small businesses altogether if it's a first-time violation and the firms quickly and sincerely move to correct the problem. Let me be clear: These changes will not be an excuse for violating criminal laws; they won't be an amnesty for businesses that harm public health; they won't enable people to undermine the safety of the public while their competitors play by the rules. But we will stop playing "gotcha" with decent, honest business people who want to be good citizens. Compliance, not punishment, should be our objective.

The second thing we want to do is to curb the Government's appetite for paperwork. We are going to have each agency allow regularly scheduled reports to the Government to be cut in half, unless there is some important public purpose that won't permit it. In other words, if people file quarterly reports, we want the agency to say file them twice a year, if they file them twice a year, file annual reports. The Vice President likes that. We'll leave more trees up, and we'll save more time for small business. Time is money. Time is the most important thing we have.

You know, we got rid of the Federal personnel manuals. I forget—the Vice President knows better than I do—I forget how many thousands of pages.

The Vice President. Ten thousand pages.

The President. Ten thousand pages. You know, I have yet to have the first Federal employee come up and attack me for that. [Laughter] I've yet to have the first citizen say, "How dare you waste my money. With this new arbitrary system, you got rid of these 10,000 pages. I can't sleep at night for thinking about it being gone." [Laughter] And believe me, nobody will notice this as long as we take care to protect the public health, the public safety, and the public interest.

The second thing I want to talk about are fundamental reforms in the area of the environment and drug and medical services. Environmental regulation touches every part of our lives. And this is a moment of transition in our environmental policy. The modern era began in 1970 with Earth Day, the passage of landmark legislation and the creation of the Environmental Protection Agency.

The results, we should never forget, are a great American success story, envied and copied around the world. Because we made a common commitment to protect the environment, people are living longer and living better, and we have a chance to pass the country along to our children and grandchildren in far better shape than would have been the case otherwise. But the methods that worked in the past aren't necessarily adequate to the present day.

Our environmental programs must work better and cost less to meet the challenges of the future. Today we are announcing a landmark package of 25 environmental re-

forms. Let me describe them in general terms.

First we recognize that market mechanisms generally make more sense than micromanagement by the Government. Letting utilities buy and sell their rights under the Clean Air Act, for example, has saved utilities and their customers \$2 billion and given us cleaner air. Today we will dramatically extend this market concept to other areas of clean air and water protection.

Second, too many businesses are afraid to come to the EPA for help in cleaning up their act because they're afraid they'll be punished. That's the story you just heard. We're going to open compliance centers to help small businesses and say to them, "If you discover a problem, you'll have 180 days to fix it with no punitive fine."

And third, because you shouldn't need a forest full of paper to protect the environment, EPA will cut its paperwork requirements on businesses and communities by 25 percent, that is 20 million hours of work for businesses and communities that will be saved for other purposes next year.

While these steps will improve the current system, others will move well beyond it to a shift in the way we actually think about regulation. EPA will launch a pilot program called Project XL, excellence and leadership, which is simple but revolutionary. They will say to the companies in the pilot and, hopefully, eventually, the companies all across the country, "Here is the pollution reduction goal. If you can figure out how to meet it, you can throw out the EPA rulebook. You figure out how to meet the goal."

I want to say, especially here, how much I appreciate both the environmental groups and the business groups that are here. We know that pollution prevention pays. We know pollution prevention and reduction is a great source of job creation for America, as well as a guarantee for our children that this country will be worth living in.

We also ought to be smart enough to know that people who are living with the consequences of this might be able to figure out how to fix it better than folks who are writing rules about it. So we're going to see if we can figure out how to do it in this way.

The other set of major reforms we're talking about involve the realms of drugs and medical devices. When I was running for President, I don't know how many Americans I had come up to me and talk to me about this all over the country but especially in places where a lot of this kind of work is done. There was a time when consumers might find that their food was adulterated, their drugs were quackery or had dreadful side effects.

Today, Americans don't have to worry about the safety or effectiveness when they buy anything from cough syrups to the latest antibiotics or pacemakers. The Food and Drug Administration has made American Drugs and medical devices the envy of the world and in demand all over the world. And we should never forget that, either. And we are going to stick with the standards we have, the highest in the world. But strong standards need not mean business as usual in every area.

Today we are announcing a set of reforms that will make our high-quality drugs and medical devices available to consumers more quickly and more cheaply. First, FDA will stop using a full-blown review every time a biotech drug company makes a minor and risk-free manufacturing change in an established drug.

Second, FDA will stop requiring costly assessments on drugs that obviously have no significant impact on the environment.

Third, FDA will eliminate 600 pages of cumbersome regulations controlling the production of antibiotics and other drugs. And I'll give you \$100 if anybody comes up to you and complains within the next 12 months—[laughter]—when you do that. And finally, 140 categories of medical devices that pose low risk to patients, from finger exercisers to oxygen masks, will no longer need preapproval by FDA before they are put on the market.

These FDA reforms and others we'll announce in the next few weeks, will keep quality at world-class levels and save industry and consumers nearly half a billion dollars a year. And I am pleased, again, to say that there are representatives from the drug and medical device industry here, as well. We appreciate your support.

I am very, very excited about this. These changes, taken together, represent real and fundamental reform. Now, they lack the sledge hammer subtlety of a moratorium, but if we're going to be responsible, we ought to fix the problem, not just seek to freeze the problem. To go from yesterday's Government to tomorrow's Government we need movement, not paralysis. We need to continue our commitment to a Government that works better, costs less, reflects our values, and can make a difference and that doesn't drive us up the wall but drives us into the future together. That is common sense, and we can give it to the American people together.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:47 a.m. at Custom Print. In his remarks, he referred to Stu McMichael, owner of Custom Print.

Remarks to the National Conference of State Legislators

March 16, 1995

Thank you, Jane Campbell, and thank you, Senator Lack, and thank you to the other leaders of the NCSL for meeting me outside. And welcome, all of you, to Washington. I know you just heard from Secretary Reich. He actually—he hasn't been here? *[Laughter]* That gives me something else to make fun of my staff about. *[Laughter]* That's what it says. Let me try—what else does it say? *[Laughter]* Maybe I should put my glasses on, and it will come out differently. *[Laughter]*

Let me say, I am delighted to see all of you. I'm about as happy to see you as you acted like you were to see me. *[Laughter]* I loved the legislative process when I was Governor, and in Arkansas we had an interesting system. We were all there in our old State capitol, and the legislature was on the third floor, and I was on the second floor. And when the legislature was in session I just sort of kept open house. If a legislator showed up, I saw him or her. And we'd have morning planning meetings at 7:30 a.m. every morning, and half the time legislators just wandered in and sat at the administration's planning meeting. And I must say, I

often think in the course of working here both for the last 2 years and for the last 2 months, if we wouldn't be better off as a country if we worked more like that up here. *[Applause]* Yes, you can clap for that. That's all right. That's a pretty good idea. *[Applause]*

I've even met half a dozen of my State legislators since I've been gone from Arkansas who said they missed me, which is something I never thought I'd hear. *[Laughter]* Warm my heart.

We have a lot of former legislators in this administration, as I'm sure you know. I see the Deputy Secretary of Education out there, Madeleine Kunin, also the former Governor of Vermont; and Arthur DeCoursey of SBA was a State legislator in Massachusetts. Patrick McGowan with the SBA was a State legislator in Maine. Thomas Redder with the SBA was a State legislator in Colorado—all the other employees for the SBA were actually in small business at one time or another—*[laughter]*—of course, Secretary Peña was as well, and Gary Blumenthal, the Executive Director of the President's Committee on Mental Retardation. So we're interested in what you're going through and in working with you.

I have said many places, but I'd like to have the privilege of repeating it here today, that I ran for this job because I felt the mission of this country at the end of the 20th century was to get us into the next century with the American dream alive and well and with America still the strongest country in the world, the greatest force for peace and freedom and democracy. Alive and well means that we have to have opportunities for more jobs and higher incomes. Half the American people are living on less money today when you adjust for inflation than they were making 15 years ago. That's one of the reasons a lot of people aren't happy in the recovery. We've got 6.1 million new jobs and the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation in 25 years, but a lot of folks' incomes are not going up. And they feel uncertain, insecure.

I get letters all the time from people I grew up with in Arkansas who are nearing that magic age of 50 talking about the uncertainty they feel about their future, their children. Are they going to be able to educate their

children? Are they going to be caught up in some great downsizing move, kind of the other side of this great churning change and all this opportunity that's out there?

The other part of the American dream is keeping our values alive, work, family, community, values you might put under the general heading of responsibility, so that we can pull back together. So I think we ought to offer more opportunity and more responsibility. I also think to do it here in Washington, we have to have a dramatic change in the way Government has worked. And I have been working hard at that for the last 2 years.

The old view was that there was kind of a one-size-fits-all—drove you nuts in the State houses of the country, I'm sure—that there was a one, single big Government solution for every big problem in America. And half the time we told you what to do and didn't give you the money to do it with.

The other view that seems to have a lot of energy around here is that, basically, maybe there's nothing for the Federal Government to do except to give the problem to you and give you less money to deal with it, and the idea is that since Government would mess up a one-car parade, we just ought to walk away from all these problems.

My view is different from that, and I guess it's forged largely on my 12 years of experience as a Governor and the fact that before I got this job I actually used to be able to spend large amounts of time talking to real people every day. I don't mean that the people I talk to aren't real people; I mean that mostly the people I talk to have business before the Government or work for the President or in some event that I've set up. I don't get to walk the streets the way I used to and just visit with people in a more informal setting.

My view is that what we need is a Government that is very different, that has less bureaucracy, that is lean but not mean, that operates in a more entrepreneurial fashion, that gives more decision to the State and local governments and to the private sector, but that is an active partner in doing three things: promoting economic opportunities through jobs and incomes, empowering people through education and training to make the most of their own lives, and enhancing the

security of our people, both in terms of safe streets and our security around the world.

And that's what I have worked to do so that if you believe that, it means that you have to have a smaller Government that is still effective, that does what it's supposed to do well and stops doing things that it shouldn't do, and that works more in partnership with you. Since I have been President, we have now given 26 States waivers from Federal rules to enact their own welfare reform proposals, and nine States waivers to do major, major health care reform, more States than the previous two administrations combined.

We've also done a lot to try to deregulate certain aspect of the private economy from undue Federal oversight. And we did a lot more about that today, and I'll say more about that in a minute. We have reduced the size of the Federal payroll by more than 100,000. We've reduced the size of the Federal deficit by \$600 billion. We're on our way to the smallest Government in Washington since Kennedy was President and 3 years of deficit reduction in a row for the first time since Truman was President. We are changing the way things operate around here.

Now that the new Congress is here, we're having a huge debate about what the role of Government ought to be. And it can be a very healthy thing indeed. I must tell you, as all of you know, I have real differences, as well as real agreements with this Congress. I have vigorous agreements and vigorous disagreements. I strongly agreed with the bill that applies to Congress the laws Congress imposes on the private sector. I thought it was long overdue and was elated to sign it. I campaigned on it in '92.

We're about to get a bill out of the conference and to my desk which will end unfunded mandates that are unreasonable and sharply reduce the ability of Congress to impose on you and on local governments requirements which we don't give you the money to pay for. And I think that is a very good thing indeed.

But I do not agree with the proposals that undermine our fundamental mission, more economic opportunity, empowering people through education and training, and increasing our security. Therefore, I don't agree

with the proposal that would eliminate the 100,000 police commitment and the crime bill that we worked for 6 years for or cut school lunches or cut our education programs, the Goals 2000 program for 4,000 schools in America or the proposal for safe and drug free schools.

Some of these proposals are embodied in the so-called rescission bill which was adopted by the House today. Some of them are embodied in their general budget. What they have in common, is, in my view, is they cut too much of people and not enough pork.

The proposal passed today would virtually eliminate the AmeriCorps program, our national service program, which is not a bureaucracy, which many of you have worked with which, as you know, is helping police on the street, helping people to build houses, helping to fight fires in the West, doing work that wouldn't be done otherwise, and letting young people earn money to pay for their education. It is a great grassroots program. It should not be eliminated.

So as we move into the future and as these bills go to the Senate, we're going to have an interesting debate here. And a lot of it will affect you. I wondered when the unfunded mandate bill passed why it wasn't made immediately effective, because I'm strong for it. I'm for the line-item veto, too, and I hope we get that up here pretty soon. There's a lot of things Republicans want to do that I am strongly in favor of. But I said to myself, why are we making an unfunded mandates bill immediately effective? And I read that rescission bill, and I realized you're going to get some "defunded" mandates. If you look at some of those cuts to the States, the responsibilities are still on you, but the money is being taken back.

So I say to you, what kind of Government do we want? We knew we had to cut some money out of the Agriculture Department, just for example. You know, the Agriculture Department got real big. And the best line that came out of the 1992 Presidential campaign, I'm embarrassed to say—I wish it were mine, but it wasn't—was Ross Perot's line about the Agriculture Department employee that had to go see a psychiatrist because he lost his farmer. Remember that? I thought

it was funnier that you did, apparently. [Laughter]

But anyway—so, we knew that we had to cut some money. What did we do? We closed 1,200 offices. What did they do? They propose cuts in the school lunch program. They say, "Well, they're not really cuts in the school lunch program." Well, yes, they are. If this proposal had been law in 1989, this year there would be one million fewer kids getting lunch at school. And a lot of these kids show up at school, and they don't have enough to eat at home. The meals they get at school is the only dad-gum good meal they get all day. There are children going to school in this country that never see a dentist until they are 16, 17, 18 years old. We want them to learn, and you know, everybody rails about the schools, I'm telling you, it's hard for a teacher to teach a poor kid who's hungry.

So I think there's a right way to do this and wrong way to do it. And it doesn't have to be a partisan deal. I told you, I'm for a lot of what they're trying to do. We do need to change the way we do business here. But we need to have the ability to bring common sense to bear in judgment, and we need to put our children and our educational system and our future first. We need to keep our eye on what is the mission. The mission to get the country into the 21st century still the strongest country in the world in a place where there's real opportunity.

Today, we had a meeting about regulation. We've got a lot of regulatory legislation here, freeze all pending regulations for 6 months or a year or whatever, and a lot of other things. Well, what I've been trying to do is not freeze it, I've been trying to fix it. Today we announced the following things in the regulatory area, something that I think is very, very important, that should be popular in every State here: We announced some dramatic changes for small business, in the environment, and in the area of drugs and medical technology.

We announced first of all, that small businesses who try to do the right thing but make a mistake, will be given the opportunity not to pay their fine to the Government but to take the money in the fine they would have paid to the Government and fix the problem in the first place and that small businesses

who make a mistake, for the first time, can have their fines waived altogether if they have never had a record of bad behavior and who are obviously trying to do the right thing.

We announced today that all Government agencies, when it is consistent with the public interest—that is, public health and well-being—will cut in half the reporting requirements for small businesses. So whenever possible, if they have to report four times a year, now they can report twice a year. If they have to report twice a year, now they can report once a year. And we think it will make a big difference and so does the Small Business Administration. We are trying to change things.

In the area of the environment we announced today that we would allow small businesses a grace period of 6 months to correct violations after they've been identified. We found out that a lot of people wouldn't call the Government and find out what the law is, because they were afraid that somebody would come see them and fine them. So we had a lot of people who were out of compliance because they were literally afraid to ask how to get in compliance.

We're going to cut environmental paperwork by 25 percent, which will save—get this—20 million hours of work per year for the American people. We are going to launch a pilot program with 50 businesses which will allow companies to reach a pollution reduction goal however they want. And if they can reach it, they can throw out the EPA rule book. Doesn't matter how they reach it, as long as they reach the production goals.

Same thing we tried to do for the schools, by the way, in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, to give you more flexibility—here are the national goals, you figure out how to meet them—in the schools, the principals, the teachers. It's a very important policy change.

In the area of drugs and biotechnology, we have decided to stop doing a full-blown and very expensive review every time a biotech company makes a minor and insignificant change in one of its products. We're going to stop requiring very costly assessments on drugs that obviously don't have any impact on the environment. We're going to eliminate 600 pages of regulation. I'll bet you

nobody will ever miss them, and it will save this industry, one of our most productive industries, \$500 billion a year.

So this is the sort of thing we're trying to do. It will make a huge difference in the life of this country. But better to fix the problem than just to freeze it in place. Better to do something real than to do something that sounds good, that maybe causes more harm than good. We all want to have water we can drink and air we can breathe and food we can eat and a place to work we can feel safe and secure in. We can do this.

Now you have to decide, without regard to your party or your region what you believe our role is, too. To make a judgment about this debate that's unfolding here, you have to make up your own mind.

You know, I spent, when I was a Governor, I bet I spent more time cussing the Federal Government than most of you do. And since I've been President, I bet I've spent even more time doing it. *[Laughter]* But the fact is that this country has benefited by 25 years of effort to clean the environment up. This country has benefited by our common efforts to make people secure at work, to make toys safe for our children. This country has benefited from these efforts, but we have forgotten common sense in a lot of the way we do things. So the trick is to put common sense back into this and reestablish a partnership that makes sense between the National Government, those of you at the State level, people at the local level, and most importantly, private citizens, so that what we do makes sense, it achieves common goals, and doesn't waste taxpayer money.

That is going to be the great debate here. And to make the judgments, you have to move beyond the rhetoric to the reality of each issue here. Everybody is for cutting Government, but I think there's a real difference between closing 1,200 offices and cutting back on food stamps. I think there's a real difference between closing the regional offices at HUD and cutting back on a program for homeless veterans at the Department of Labor. I think there's a difference. I think it matters.

I don't think all Federal Government spending is the same. I think with drug use on the rise and among young people again,

for reasons that are almost impossible to understand, young people thinking that it's no longer really dangerous to fool with drugs again, not to mention illegal, to cut out all of these programs that would give 94 percent of the schools in this country an opportunity to make their schools safer and more drug-free, whether it's metal detectors and police officers or more folks in there teaching prevention, is not common sense.

So I believe if we'll work together, check our rhetorical baggage, and try to get this country into the 21st century remembering our mission, we can cut a good deal more spending without cutting our kids and our future. We can absolutely, dramatically reduce the unfair burden of regulation without undermining the quality of our environment or the safety of our lives.

In short, we can do what Americans have always done. We have always been philosophically conservative, pragmatic, operationally progressive people who got the job done and moved the country into the future. That's how we have performed. That's why we're still around after over 200 years. That is the genius of our constitutional system. That's how you pass a budget in your legislature every year.

So, since you're up here in a leadership conference, I would urge you without regard to your party or your region, to urge this course on the Congress—[applause]—urge this course on the Congress. You know, I don't need any lectures in the need to cut spending. We reduced the deficit \$600 billion without a lot of help 2 years ago. And we're going to do it some more. But we cannot walk away from our responsibilities to our children and to our future. We have got to stop a lot of this crazy regulation, but we have got to do it in a way that leaves us not only more prosperous in the short run but leaves us with a safer and more secure environment and a healthier citizenry over the long run.

We can do this. We don't have to make a bunch of bogus choices. But we've got to act more like most people do at the State level and at the local level. We've got to be committed to solving problems, putting people first, checking the ideological baggage at the door. I hope you'll help us do that. If

you do, we'll help you make America a better place.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:20 p.m. at the Hyatt Regency Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Jane Campbell, president, National Conference of State Legislators, and James Lack, New York State senator.

Statement on the Justice Department's Conclusion of the Investigation of Transportation Secretary Federico Peña

March 16, 1995

This is good news for a Secretary of Transportation who's doing a great job. I'm pleased for Federico.

Memorandum on Assistance to the Palestinian Police Force

March 16, 1995

Presidential Determination No. 95-17

Memorandum for the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense

Subject: Drawdown of Commodities and Services from the Inventory and Resources of the Department of Defense to Support Activities of the Palestinian Police Force

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by section 552(c)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, 22 U.S.C. 2348a(c)(2) (the "Act"), I hereby determine that:

- (1) as a result of an unforeseen emergency, the provision of assistance under Chapter 6 of Part II of the Act in amounts in excess of funds otherwise available for such assistance is important to the national interests of the United States; and
- (2) such unforeseen emergency requires the immediate provision of assistance under Chapter 6 of Part II of the Act.

I therefore direct the drawdown of commodities and services from the inventory and resources of the Department of Defense of an aggregate value not to exceed \$5 million

to provide and transport 200 vehicles and concurrent spare parts to Israel for use by the Palestinian police force.

The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to report this determination to the Congress and to arrange for its publication in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

NOTE: This memorandum was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on March 17.

Remarks at a Saint Patrick's Day Ceremony With Prime Minister John Bruton of Ireland and an Exchange With Reporters

March 17, 1995

The President. Good morning. Please be seated. Happy St. Patrick's Day. It's a great pleasure for me to welcome the Prime Minister here. This is the Taoiseach's first visit to the United States since he assumed office. So on this St. Patrick's Day, I think we should begin with an appropriate greeting, *Ceade mile failte*, a hundred thousand welcomes.

Mr. Prime Minister, I think, in this symbolic ceremony, you should go first. So I want to turn the microphone over to you.

Prime Minister Bruton. Thank you very much. Mr. President, Mr. Vice President, Secretary of State, ladies and gentleman: It's a wonderful honor for me to be received here as the leader of an Irish Government of a country, Ireland, that's now at peace, at peace after 25 years of violence.

I want to say that you, Mr. President, probably as much as any individual, have helped to bring that about. When you look back on your administration, I think the bringing of peace to Ireland will rank as one of your major personal achievements. The willingness that you showed, Mr. President, to take risks, to do things that many of us might have thought were foolhardy at the time, like granting a visa to Gerry Adams—it has been proven to be—you have been proven to be right. You made the right decision.

The results are there for all of us to see, because you gave that organization the sense of confidence in itself and a glimpse of the political dividend that was there for them by

pursuing a peaceful rather than a violent path. That vista that you opened up to them by that decision enabled them, gave them the confidence to end their campaign and take a new road.

Others need to show similar courage and generosity. And I know that the United States will be willing to play the same crucial role in being a friend to all in Ireland and encouraging all in Ireland to be generous risktakers, as you have been, Mr. President, in your dealings with Ireland since the commencement of your administration.

My purposes in coming here today, on St. Patrick's Day, is to thank you very, very much, from the bottom of my heart, for what you have done, and to look forward to working with you and your administration and, indeed, Congress on a bipartisan basis on building on this, your great achievement.

The President. Thank you.

Prime Minister Bruton. Now, Mr. President, it is my high honor to present you with some shamrocks to celebrate this great day.

The President. Thank you very much, Mr. Prime Minister, for the beautiful gift, the beautiful Irish crystal. I hope the shamrocks will bring us the luck of the Irish over the next few months. [*Laughter*]

Today, we don't have to look much further than the green ties and the dresses in this room to be reminded of the bonds between the United States and Ireland, the common heritage we share and have shared since the beginning of our country's existence. Much of America's love of freedom has Irish roots, whether our ancestors were Catholics or Protestants. Four signers of the Declaration of Independence were born in Ireland. At least nine more were of Irish descent. And many of our bravest soldiers in the Revolutionary War were Irish-Americans.

Today the Irish are still fighting the good fight, the fight for peace in Lebanon and Somalia and the Balkans. Irish troops under U.N. command have braved great dangers in the quest for peace. Ireland has also opened a school to train U.N. peacekeepers from other nations so that we may all benefit from Ireland's experience.

Ireland has demonstrated its commitment to peace most powerfully, of course, in the efforts to end the violence in Northern Ire-

land. On this St. Patrick's Day, as the Taoiseach said, Northern Ireland is closer than at any time in a generation to a just and lasting settlement of the differences of the people who share that small country's land.

At this historic moment, I salute Prime Minister Bruton for his tireless efforts for peace and for continuing the work of his predecessor, Prime Minister Reynolds, in completing the joint framework document for Northern Ireland with the British Prime Minister, John Major, who also deserves our salutes for the brave risks that he has taken to make peace. This is a landmark step for all the parties to bring them together and forge a new partnership for reconciliation.

Today I want to take this opportunity, this St. Patrick's Day, once again to urge all the parties to look carefully at the framework, to accept it as the basis for moving forward. I call on all those who still resort to violence to end the beatings, the intimidations, the shootings. To those who have laid down their arms, I ask you now to take the next step and begin to seriously discuss getting rid of these weapons so they can never be used again and violence will never again return to the land.

I welcome the statement by Sinn Fein, reiterating its readiness to include the issue of weapons in the talks with the British Government. It must be included, and progress must be made.

As we have in the past, the United States stands ready to help those who are taking risks for peace. Our economic initiatives in Ireland are proceeding under the supervision of former Senator George Mitchell. In May we are hosting a White House Conference on Trade and Investment in Ireland. And there's tremendous interest in this conference from our private sector.

Mr. Prime Minister, the United States will continue to support your efforts and those of Prime Minister Major. You have done very much to bring the prospect of a new day to Northern Ireland.

I'm also pleased to announce that beginning April 1st, Irish citizens visiting the United States on vacations or business will no longer require visas. This step is another demonstration of our confidence in the fu-

ture of Ireland and the strong ties between our nations.

I finally want to say that I am very much looking forward to our reception tonight at the White House. I'm glad that you, Mr. Prime Minister, and Mrs. Bruton will join us. And we're going to have a high old Irish time. *[Laughter]*

In closing, let me thank the Secretary of State, and our fine Ambassador to Ireland, Jean Kennedy Smith, for the work they have done in supporting the White House and the President in our efforts to help you bring peace.

Thank you all very much.

Peace Process in Northern Ireland

Q. Mr. President, may I ask you, first of all, how you have reacted to what appears to be an implied British Government criticism of your decision to allow Mr. Adams to come into this country? And do you agree with those other Irish-Americans who seem to believe that the British Government and that John Major is being slow, too slow, in allowing his ministers to talk to Mr. Adams?

The President. Well, let me answer it in this way. First of all, I have had a good relationship during my Presidency with Prime Minister Major. And the United States has had a very unique and powerful relationship with Great Britain for a very long time. We may differ from time to time about the specific actions that each would take, but our goal is the same. And I think we all have to recognize the risks that Prime Minister Major has taken for peace within the context in which he must operate.

So I look forward to having a chance to visit with him in the next couple of days about this, and I'm basically very positive about it. And if you're the President of the United States, there are days when you're grateful for implied criticism. Most of it's expressed. *[Laughter]*

Q. Mr. President, you were asking for people who have guns and have used them in Ireland to take the next step. How soon do you think that next step might be taken by the IRA and Sinn Fein?

The President. Well, I know that it couldn't come soon enough for me. And this whole business about weapons decommis-

sioning is, obviously, critical to the completion of the process. And we here in the United States have reached out not only to Sinn Fein, but also to the Unionists. The Prime Minister has pointed that out. The Vice President and my National Security Adviser have, on more than one occasion, tried to establish contacts to make sure we were reaching out to everyone in Northern Ireland.

And the important thing to me is that we keep pushing this process and keep it going in the right direction. And I have every confidence that that will occur.

Wolf [Wolf Blitzer, Cable News Network].

Russia

Q. Mr. President, President Yeltsin announced that he's willing to eliminate military hardware from his V-E parade on May 9th in order to encourage you to join others in Moscow to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II. Is that enough to encourage you to go to Moscow, and will you include a trip to Ireland after that? [Laughter]

The President. Well, I appreciate what President Yeltsin said today. And I expect to be making a decision about that whole set of issues very shortly. And when I do, I'll announce it.

Q. Mr. President, Is Chechnya the stumbling block?

Peace Process in Northern Ireland

Q. Mr. President, What pressures can the U.S. administration bring on Sinn Fein, particularly in regards to the decommissioning of arms? And was there a quid pro quo in that area for your granting a visa to Gerry Adams to fundraise in the United States?

The President. Well, certainly, his prompt statement about the willingness of Sinn Fein to discuss arms decommissioning had an influence on my decision. I think it's important that the United States take some steps along the way, as the Prime Minister has said, to keep this process going. When others take appropriate steps, I think it makes it a lot easier for us to do the same thing.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:40 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. In his re-

marks, he referred to Gerry Adams, leader of the Sinn Fein.

Memorandum on Federal Employees Affected by California Floods

March 17, 1995

Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies

Subject: Excused Absence for Employees Affected by Widespread Flooding in California

I am deeply concerned about the devastating losses caused by widespread flooding in California and the impact on the well-being and livelihood of our fellow Americans who have been affected by this disaster. Many parts of the Federal Government have been mobilized to respond to this disaster.

As part of this effort, I request heads of executive departments and agencies who have Federal civilian employees in the areas designated as disaster areas because of the flooding to use their discretion to excuse from duty, without charge to leave or loss of pay, any such employee who is faced with a personal emergency because of the flooding and who can be spared from his or her usual responsibilities. This policy should also be applied to any employee who is needed for emergency law enforcement, relief, or clean-up efforts authorized by Federal, State, or local officials having jurisdiction.

William J. Clinton

Remarks Honoring the 1994 National Hockey League Champion New York Rangers

March 17, 1995

Good afternoon. Please be seated.

I'm delighted to see all of you here, and welcome to the White House and to the Rose Garden. You come on the first day that the trees are blooming, so you're bringing us all wonderful weather.

It's an honor for me to host the New York Rangers here, including the Commissioner of the National Hockey League, Gary Bettman, the President and General Man-

ager of the Rangers, Neil Smith, Coach Colin Campbell and Assistant Coach Dick Todd. And I think Congressman Eliot Engel was supposed to be here, and he is unless they're still voting.

It was last June 14th when the Rangers won the Stanley Cup, finally breaking the infamous curse. The next day I got a letter from Senator Moynihan, a big Ranger fan, who said that since the Rangers brought the Cup back to Madison Square Garden, I should bring the Rangers to the Rose Garden. I'm delighted you're finally here. We've been trying to arrange this visit for some time, but what's a few months compared to 54 years. [Laughter]

I can't tell you how much I personally enjoyed the playoffs. I really got into them. I tried to rearrange my schedule so that I could see the games. I enjoyed seeing Mark Messier predicting and delivering a victory when your backs were against the wall. I enjoyed Brian Leetch's MVP playoff performance, the first by an American-born player. And I especially enjoyed your goalie, Mike Richter's, acrobatic saves. All of us here in Washington can appreciate what goalies do because we have so many shots taken at us every day. [Laughter] And I was hoping, maybe in addition to a jersey, one of you could loan me a face mask for the next year or so. [Laughter]

I also want to say something that I observed watching these playoffs. Stars alone don't win championships; teams do. I remember your chant from last year, "Heave ho. Everybody pulling together." This year it's turned into "Heave ho. Two in a row."

The Stanley Cup is the oldest trophy competition by professional athletes in North America, the only trophy that bears the names of not only the teams but the individual players who won it.

I'd also like to say a special word of appreciation because the Rangers boast the first four Russians ever to have their names engraved on the Stanley Cup, another sign of our increasingly interconnected global community and America's outreach to the rest of the world.

I also admire the tradition that the entire team shares the Stanley Cup. Each player gets to take it home to friends and to family.

This team took that one step further, because the Rangers know that teamwork isn't only about the guys who lace up the skates, it's also about your fans, too. And if ever a team had great fans, you do. So you paid your fans back by remembering right after the victory a longtime fan who had passed away, by bringing the cup to sick children in the hospital and even by bringing the cup to restaurants and bars throughout New York—[laughter]—as well as to one of the Vice President's favorite hangouts, the David Letterman show.

For all that, I thank you. Your victory has shown us what is best about professional sports, perseverance, hard work, real commitment to working together. It's an example for which all of us in Madison Square Garden and the Rose Garden are very grateful.

Congratulations, and welcome again.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:39 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House.

Digest of Other White House Announcements

The following list includes the President's public schedule and other items of general interest announced by the Office of the Press Secretary and not included elsewhere in this issue.

March 12

The President declared a major disaster in the State of California and ordered Federal aid to supplement State and local recovery efforts in the areas struck by winter storms that caused flooding, landslides, and mud debris flows beginning February 13.

March 13

In the afternoon, the President was presented with the Boy Scout Report to the Nation by Boy Scout of America representatives in the Oval Office.

March 14

The President declared a major disaster in the State of South Dakota and ordered Federal aid to supplement State and local recovery efforts in the areas struck by severe win-

ter storms for the period of January 13–February 10.

The President announced his intention to appoint Paul Warnke, Albert Carnesale, Mike Mochizuki, and Gregory van der Vink to be members of the Scientific and Policy Advisory Committee of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

The President announced his intention to appoint LeRoy F. Saunders to the Committee for Purchase from People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled.

March 15

In the morning, the President met with California State legislators in the Roosevelt Room to discuss flood relief efforts.

March 16

In the afternoon, the President attended a St. Patrick's Day luncheon at the Capitol. Later, he briefly met with President Franjo Tudjman of Croatia; Kresimir Zubak, President, and Ejup Ganic, Vice President, Federation of Bosnian Muslims and Croats; and Tatjana Lujic-Mijatovic, Presidency Member, Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina in the Roosevelt Room. He then met with President Tudjman in the Oval Office.

The President declared nine additional counties in California as major disaster areas following winter storms which caused flooding and mud slides.

March 17

In the evening, the President and Hillary Clinton hosted an Irish reception on the State Floor.

The President announced his intention to appoint Linda Alvarado to the President's Advisory Commission on Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans.

The President announced his intention to appoint Mary Houghton to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Credit Standards Advisory Committee.

The President announced his intention to appoint Louis V. Gerstner, Jr., and John A. Georges to be members of the Advisory Committee for Trade Policy and Negotiations.

Nominations Submitted to the Senate

The following list does not include promotions of members of the Uniformed Services, nominations to the Service Academies, or nominations for Foreign Service officers.

Submitted March 14

Mary Beck Briscoe,
of Kansas, to be U.S. Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, vice James K. Logan, retired.

Checklist of White House Press Releases

The following list contains releases of the Office of the Press Secretary that are neither printed as items nor covered by entries in the Digest of Other White House Announcements.

Released March 13

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Released March 14

Transcripts of press briefings by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the President's intention to issue an Executive order prohibiting certain transactions with respect to development of Iranian petroleum resources

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry announcing that the Justice Department will join an appeal of the decision in a Federal District Court in Texas on the Religious Freedom Restoration Act

Announcement of the nomination for the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit

Released March 15

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on reinventing Government

Released March 16

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by Elaine Kamarck, Senior Policy Adviser to the Vice President; Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Carol Browner; Small Business Administrator Phil Lader; and Federal Drug Administrator David Kessler on regulatory reform

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the President's meeting with Bosnian and Croatian leaders

Advance text of Surgeon General-Designate Henry Foster's remarks to the National Newspaper Publishers Association

Released March 17

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by Health and Human Services Secretary Donna Shalala on child support enforcement

White House statement on child support enforcement

Listing of Democratic Senators meeting with the President

**Acts Approved
by the President**

NOTE: No acts approved by the President were received by the Office of the Federal Register during the period covered by this issue.